The Forum

AUGUST, 1897.

A PLEA FOR THE ARMY.

In the present article, it is my purpose to discuss the following three questions; viz., (1) Is there a want of public spirit on the part of the American people? (2) Are our people unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to secure the national safety? (3) How can we best prepare for days of national peril?

(1) As far as public spirit is concerned, there is certainly no dearth in our country. In one way or another, public spirit crops out in every Presidential Message. It is shown in the liberality of Congress toward improvements of rivers and harbors, in the construction of post-offices, in the enlargement of postal advantages, in the matter of pensions to veteran soldiers and sailors. It is evinced in superb monuments erected in honor of successful and distinguished leaders. At the mention of the names of our heroes, patriotic fervor thrills every assembly, regardless of political affinities; the "star-spangled banner," seen or sung, brings tearful joy to the eyes of the aged, love and confidence to manhood, fresh enthusiasm to childhood and youth.

In regard to the many vital problems in whose solution our people are deeply interested, such as the currency, the finances, the relations of capital and labor, and so on, there are differences of opinion frequently leading to serious contentions, and sometimes, though rarely, to riots. Yet I venture the assertion that, in spite of these contentions, nine-tenths of the people who enter into them are at heart thoroughly loyal to the flag and all that it represents. Even ignorant immigrants —those who are not vicious—love the sight of the flag. We had To-

Copyright, 1896, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to republish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ries and Copperheads in war: now their offspring are ashamed of their record. We have some pessimists in peace: but they are not dangerous; for, however much they may flatter themselves, they are in a woful minority. In a word, American patriotism was never healthier, never more widespread—North and South—than now.

(2) In answer to the second question, we may confidently say that our people are always ready and willing to make sacrifices for the national safety. They can be relied on to lay their property and their lives on the altar of sacrifice, and to sustain Congress and the President in any crisis which may arise, if the necessity for such sacrifice be made clear to them.

(3) When we come to the third question—how best to prepare for days of national peril—we meet with a difficulty emanating from our most conscientious citizens, who, through misconception, are promulgating doctrines most inimical to our safety. I refer to that form of public opinion which springs from the teachers of our children and youth, and which may, in time, by narrow and harmful precepts, rob the courts of the posse comitatus, the city of its police, the State of its conservative guard, and the country of its proper national defence.

To my mind, the teaching which discredits and dishonors the posse comitatus, the police, the national guard, the army, and the navy is clearly wrong. Where law, order, and national honor cannot be enforced, there will be lawlessness, disorder, and national disgrace, whose end is national death.

It is not wise to tell our children that public defence by arms is always intrinsically wrong. It is not right to tell them that the world has so advanced in peace-sentiment that cities and States are now safe without guards, that absolute reliance can be placed upon peaceful diplomacy for the settlement of all conflicts likely to arise. Washington, who feared God and endeavored to be governed by the teachings of Holy Writ, said: "If we desire peace, one of the most powerful instruments in our prosperity, it must be known [*i. e.*, among nations] that we are at all times ready for war."

General Sherman, with his large experience and sincere heart, said: "I cannot help plead to my countrymen, at every opportunity, to cherish all that is manly and noble in the military profession, because peace is enervating, and no man is wise enough to foretell when soldiers may be in demand again."

What we need is preparation by organization and discipline. With modern arms, ordnance, and ammunition, and with modern means of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

locomotion and communication, war comes with suddenness. The small cloud of rumor, the gathering multitudes, are followed, quicker than thought, by lightning-flashes and the roar of artillery. The war between Prussia and Austria in 1866 began and ended within two short months; and what an object lesson it presented! Prussia defeated Austria in a six weeks' campaign. Prussia was prepared for war: Austria was not.

The same lesson is found in all other modern wars. Major G. S. Wilson, in the "Journal of the Military Science Institute," says:

> "At the end of a seven months' war France was abject at the feet of Germany, despoiled of her provinces, and compelled to pay her conqueror the cost of her own humiliation. Germany was prepared for war: France was not. . . . The hordes of Chinese were as chaff before the wind in the face of Japan's organized and disciplined army."

The struggle between Turkey and Greece is no exception. Turkey was prepared for war: Greece was not. Plucky little kingdom of Greece—how American hearts yearned for her success! But poor organization, no preparation, no proper discipline or drill, and naturally no practical generalship, produced their inevitable results. God Himself did not interpose in behalf of the Greeks and miraculously deliver them, though the Great Powers stung them to action by their unjust measures. He suffered them to learn anew the old lesson; namely, that safety is found in abundant preparation and unceasing vigilance. The average American of a century ago was, in many respects, better prepared for active service than the average citizen of to-day. Everywhere was the rifle over the fireplace; the household accustomed to alarms; and the householder ready to meet Indians, or to run to his company's rendezvous in order to make head against forays from across the border. To-day he has no rifle, and seldom hears the discharge of a firearm.

It is the railway and steamship transportation over against long marches, sailing vessels, and river *bateaux*—the old method of conveying fighting men and supplies—which has practically cut off all time for proper preparation in modern warfare. As was recently demonstrated in Greece, the best of men will not immediately be good soldiers, even if collected into armed battalions. Experience is essential to overcome the natural apprehensions which a recruit always has at the approach of danger. The veteran may not be braver; but his knowledge has prepared him for what is coming, so that all unnecessary alarms are excluded. A writer in the "Service Gazette" on what war means remarks as follows:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"War-trained troops, men who have looked upon slaughter and death upon the gigantic scale of the modern struggle, no longer exist; and the peace-trained conscript has no knowledge to correct his fear. The machinery of battle has progressed till the possibilities of our modern weapons are appalling. Torpedoes, monster guns, high explosives, the swift arbitrament of the ram at sea; on land, quick-firing guns using the deadly shrapnel, are almost untried implements. . . . The future battle will be a severer trial to the nerves than any past encounter."

Hence we feel the need of experience. The recently added terrors, he thinks, have made men's fears dominant and harder to control, in spite of force of habit and a sense of duty. I find in this country no evidence of decay of natural courage; yet I do know that organization and discipline are essential to an effective army, and that time and experience are necessary to establish a reasonable degree of discipline. This is doubly true since the seeming dangers as well as the actual perils have so evidently increased. Again, commanders, from the lower to the higher grades, must become acquainted with their men as well as with their duties. In comradeship, in mutual confidence, in common knowledge, the cementing process ever increases with time and experience.

There are some potent evils to be corrected. During our great struggle in the Civil War the soldier's uniform was an honor, and reward was given for gallant conduct. But, the danger being passed, our people, little by little, have fallen back into the old ways of doing and thinking. Citizens in common life encourage desertions from the army. They decry the regular service itself as if it were an enslavement; forgetting that, with us, all enlisted men are bona-fide volunteers. In peace it is not always the most patriotic and faithful officer—one who clings to his regiment or corps—that obtains most recognition and honor. The habit of seeking preferment through outside influences is indeed quite general, and is too often successful. If those who most frequently shirk duty obtain the rewards, the effect is doubly injurious to the military arm: it demoralizes and weakens the force, and adds to its unpopularity among the people. It is this evil, and the false notion that the army on a peace footing is idle, which give rise to the constant opposition to its increase, and, in some quarters, to its existence.

I shall not dilate upon the work of the army in time of so-called peace. I simply desire to say that if there were no other duty throughout our wide domain than the care of the army forts, posts, and public property, the task would not be inconsiderable. And when I mention that, in addition, it is called upon to drill and discipline the forces of artillery, infantry, and cavalry; to carry on the various army schools;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to take care of all the United States armories, arsenals, and depots; to perform the lighthouse duty of our enormous coasts; to carry through the river and harbor improvements; to keep in touch with the State troops, also doing staff duty with the governors; and that hundreds of officers are detailed to inspect the national guard, and to teach at our military schools, our colleges and universities, I give but a meagre outline of the work devolving upon our little army.

There is one important matter for which the army will be held responsible; viz., its part in the seacoast defence. Sites have been carefully selected about New York and other cities and along our eastern and western seaboards. There are a few heavy guns of modern construction to be raised, loaded, properly aimed, fired, and lowered; there is carefully adjusted machinery to be rightly worked and managed. Who shall intelligently meet these requirements? Who shall be ready to instruct new men, when all the guns are mounted and all the machinery is put in? The mortar batteries, a few already finished, are excellent. With satisfaction one finds squares of water-front surveyed and platted for miles out. One is led to imagine shells projected into the air and falling perhaps four at a time upon the deck of a venturesome cruiser that may invade a square. But who is there to learn all the complications involved in mortar preparation and rapid mortar firing? And who is there to teach these things to the fresh volunteer artilleryman after war has come and cities are threatened by a foreign navy? We have, in embryo, torpedo arrangements, projected shore-batteries, and theoretic floating ordnance of great power; but, when ready for use, where are the skilled artillerymen to handle them? To answer these questions is to confess a great national folly.

I like the old proverb, "Whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well." If you make seacoast defences and furnish them with modern appliances, then man them with enough trained artillerymen to take care of the material and use it effectively. A bona-fide American is apt to be boastful. The uneducated, unread man, or one of limited experience, judges imperfectly another's trade: the less he knows of it, the easier it appears to him to be able to master its requirements. Similarly men who know the least about military affairs think they could easily wear a uniform, return salutes, go through the parade and drills, and stand guard; that they could skilfully organize, feed, clothe, train, and dispose a force to receive an attack or to make one upon an organized, well-equipped foe. Could such people once see under the hail of bullets a good speech-making officer with but little military expe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rience, on the one hand, and, on the other, a man like Sumner, Hancock, or Sheridan,—one who by his leadership and example could almost annihilate fear, and fill every soldier under him with courage,—they would acknowledge the difference. Professional knowledge and experience are required for the development of military character and skill.

Some years ago a report which I made, advocating an increase of our regular force, was denounced by certain leaders of working-men's organizations. They claimed that I wanted to exploit militarism and maintain an Old-World establishment; that I was an enemy to organized labor and hostile to the best interests of the working-man. Those leaders misunderstood me. What I favor is only a reasonable nucleus of an army,—an educated staff, commissioned and non-commissioned, together with a number of trained soldiers sufficient to handle our guns and to be a rallying-point in case of national peril or of sudden foreign war. A large, dominating military force, proud and overbearing, I should abominate; but to maintain enough police for city and country would be only common sense. My heart goes with all working-men in every lawful effort they make to better their condition. As I understand it, they themselves do not advocate riots, lynchings, mob-rule, or any other criminal proceeding: they condemn the Anarchists, who are enemies to law and social order; and they deprecate all combinations whose purpose is to break up and destroy our government.

Without the slightest disposition to raise the military above the civil functionary, it does appear to me that an average of about one thousand trained men for each State and Territory would not be too many for the purposes I have indicated; and this number would scarcely suffice unless we should continue to develop and cherish more and more the State national guard, as well as to encourage military education in our larger institutions of learning. In view of the fact that our relations with Spain have been and still are strained, it is from sheer necessity that such measures are advocated; and it is a mistake to say, as one of our prominent newspaper correspondents puts it, that "military men desiring promotion are strongly urging the recognition of Cuban independence or belligerent rights." Take, for example, the opinion of an army officer prominent in the Engineer Corps:—

"What then, are our real needs in the way of coast defence? . . . Upon the whole extent of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts there are about thirty ports which demand local protection for their cities, now exposed to occupation or destruction, and of these about a dozen are so important as centres of commercial wealth that the entire country has much at stake in their security. Nine out of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this number are also important as containing naval stations and depots of supply, without which our new battleships would be unable to keep the sea or perform any service in war; for it must not be forgotten that naval bases are as indispensable in these days of steam as are bases of supplies for armies in the field. In fact, this statement hardly puts the matter strongly enough; for our new ships would be exposed to capture and used against us, should they attempt to operate on their natural element, the ocean, without ports of refuge in which to find security when overmatched. Besides these thirty ports now urgently demanding protection there are about seventy others whose local importance would justify inexpensive earthworks."

Another officer, speaking of these seacoast defences, says:—

"It is estimated that, when completed, these defences would require from seventy to eighty thousand men to man them in the time of war. . . . Such eminent soldiers as Sherman and Sheridan and a host of others have time and again called attention to the dangers that threaten this country from a neglect of the army, and asked for such reasonable addition of soldiers as, in their judgment, would at least partially remedy the evil. Now, the significance of all this is simply that when an intelligent man of affairs is led by his duties to fully investigate the subject, the dangers of continued neglect of the military necessities of the country become apparent."

My association with military men has been quite extensive; and I believe the sentiment is universal among them, that our statesmen and political leaders should carefully look before they leap. Before they risk a national conflict let them glance at the present stage of preparation. Their military men want no promotion at the expense of national disaster.

Upon the causes of irritation between Spain and the United States I need not elaborate. They have resulted from press agitation; from American indignation at Spanish mismanagement in Cuban affairs; from the presence of hosts of Cuban sympathizers in our commercial cities; from commercial losses in Cuba; and from the treatment of our citizens there. We are told that our Executive proposes a qualified interference in the internal affairs of Cuba,—a territory which the Spanish government claims as part of its kingdom as much as Castile. The better treatment which we demand for our citizens in the disturbed districts of Cuba, Spain can hardly extend to her own,—to those not in revolt. Spain's *amour propre* is wounded.

Our most aggressive writers and public speakers contend that they have no fear of war with Spain, because we are so much bigger and stronger, and because of Spain's apparent exhaustion. In the end we should conquer, without doubt. But I beg rash thinkers to consider the primary dangers. They are plain enough to all foreign navies that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are watching us; viz., our extensive coast and our coast trade; the exposed shipping, cities, and villages; the ability of Spain to issue the inevitable letters-of-marque to all sorts of vessels ploughing the ocean. Our navy, good as it is, cannot be everywhere at the same time. Spain on her coasts has small return to offer in the way of reprisal; so that the first great danger and loss would necessarily fall to our side. Perhaps the fright would be worse for our people than the actual losses. Let not the causers and makers of war, however, be too confident!

The Spanish troops now under arms are as follows:

In Cuba:		
From before the present war	25,000	
National Guard	60,000	
Sent since March 1, 1895	187,282	
		272,282
In Porto Rico		6,000
In the Philippine Islands		36,760
In Spain:		
Infantry	64,190	
Cavalry	14,346	
Artillery	11,774	
Engineers	5,294	
General Service Corps	2,400	
Civil Guard	14,786	
		112,790
Total		427,832

In the event of a sudden war with Spain, to meet the land side, we have 28,238 regulars—officers and men. More than half of this army would be needed in the fortifications and posts now occupied. These, in time, would be replaced by volunteers; but the process would necessarily be slow. The total number of the national guard in the United States now organized is 112,879, of which only a fraction, according to past experience, would be available outside their own States. Of course the immediate resort would be to a large force of volunteers.

It is claimed in our favor that Spain is bankrupt. But her debt, like that of Turkey, might itself beget assistance. Even if her debt should be repudiated, the people, being in earnest, might willingly make the necessary sacrifices, like our Southern confederacy of 1864. It will hardly do to trust to Spain's weakness or bankruptcy. Neither nations nor men ever surrender their vital interests to others unless compelled by force.

Surely if, for any cause, we warred with Spain, she would quickly secure allies. Monarchical establishments, however favorably disposed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toward *quasi* free institutions, have a common sympathy, and are naturally jealous of us. If we enter the lists for European wars, we must expect a very widespread opposition.

A statement of England's forces is suggestive. The British army numbers: at home, 106,000 men; in the Colonies, 33,644; in India, 78,043; in Egypt, 4,407; making an aggregate of 222,094. If Great Britain has to raise yearly, as she does, more recruits than we have men in our whole army, it is, undoubtedly, because she needs them. The British army does nothing to limit or restrict the individual freedom of the citizen—except in the service itself as we do. Certainly we might risk a small force, say one-fourth as many, which would give us a reasonable nucleus without begetting even a tendency among us either to militarism or to endanger our civil liberty.

The unanimity with which Congress sustained the President in his Venezuelan Message showed how impulsively patriotic were our people. Congress exemplified the readiness of the latter for sacrifices in a cause in which they believe. It should be noted, however, that the cost of that one Message, manifested by the contraction of values in such investments as railway stocks, bonds, etc., was about equal to the cost of the entire Civil War. Temporary losses, indeed, they were; but they appeared real enough at the time. No such sudden depression would have been likely to occur if our seaboard had been properly fortified and manned, our regular army sufficiently large, and our national guard organized, armed, and equipped for such an emergency. An English military writer at the time remarked :—

> "However defective our army organization may be, it is difficult to conceive that we [English] could not have 200,000 men on the Canadian frontier long before the United States could train and equip 50,000. . . . The general position of the United States and Great Britain at war would be strikingly analogous to that of China and Japan. Japan was ready; and China had made no real preparations. England *is* ready; and the United States are in no way ready."

We may yet be taught, by those who are hostile to our vital interests, to be always thoroughly prepared for defence and independence.

Upon the subject of organization, not much need be said. Secretary Lamont asked Congress for two more regiments of artillery, and for a change of organization, so that we might adopt the modern form rather than *remain alone with China*. It is evident that his requests should have been granted. Senator Proctor, while Secretary of War, formed the infantry regiments into two battalions of four companies each. This, in spite of the original ten-company formation, gave small

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

battalions, adequate to the control of firing-line in extended order; but for effective work the regiments should preferably be larger and have the three-battalion formation.

Our small regular army being a part of our national defence, ought to be the best possible, and adequate to the work to which it is constantly put in peace and in war. In Chicago, in 1894, two thousand regulars—all that were available—were collected; and these had to be brought great distances. That they succeeded in preventing their own destruction when arrayed in the face of thousands of disaffected and violent men, was due to the coolness and courage of the officers and enlisted soldiers. When Captain Hall, in command of one troop of cavalry, rode alone in front of an angry mob of at least five thousand men and women, and begged them to listen to reason, the case seemed desperate. He told them plainly that he would have to fire if they did not go back. His nerve and self-command instantly awed them, and caused them to retire without a shot. It is not right to risk so much or to expose brave and true men to destruction, where an adequate force can be so easily provided. The larger command is the best guarantee of the peace we all love,—a peace obtained, if possible, without bloodshed.

A desire for some sort of promotion is not unreasonable; and it is essential to the continued efficiency of an army. A reasonable increase, say of one soldier to each thousand of our population, would be ample. The primary and subsequent promotions could then follow. One senior lieutenant of artillery in our army has been a lieutenant for thirty years. The senior captain of cavalry has remained a captain since 1874. He was an officer of volunteers for ten years before he became a regular, and an enlisted man prior to that. Many second lieutenants of cavalry have served longer in the army than Sheridan, Schofield, or myself had served when we became major-generals in the field.

There are many hopeful features nowadays in the line of discipline and drill. We need simply bear in mind the 800,000 railroad men who are subjected not only to order, discipline, and obedience, prompt and unquestioned, but, in many instances, to every sort of exposure and hardship as well. The schools of the United States are remarkable for the exact obedience and movement on the part of the pupils under the slightest intimations from their superintendents and teachers. There are in these institutions probably 5,000,000 boys, who, for at least ten years of their young lives, are accustomed to take part in what General Sherman called "all that is manly and noble in the military profession." Again, the athletic exercises in Young Men's Associations, normal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools, academies, colleges, and universities are under chosen leadership; both the body and the mind of the participants being subjected to exercises corresponding to those demanded of the cadets at Annapolis and West Point. These statements indicate the ease with which 2,000,000 volunteers, whose hearts are in the cause, might be marshalled, trained, armed, and equipped for the defence of the land.

Since I entered the army in 1850, I have noted a constant improvement in that body. The average enlisted man now is not more loyal to the flag, but he is more intelligent than formerly. The introduction of athletics has given him more suppleness of action; and his movements appear freer. Of late his education has been well provided for; while discipline, which is vastly more needed in a republic than in a monarchy, has not been relaxed. The environment of officers and soldiers, as a rule, has improved their social advantages: they have come from frontiers to the neighborhood of centres of population. The enlistment is for three years only; and during that time the young men in our garrisons are simply at school: hence there can be no excuse for looseness of morals. At present, officers are proud of the intelligence and uprightness of their men. More immorality is brought into the army than is generated there. The recruiting officers reject fully as many applicants as they accept; and, if possible, they keep out a drunkard, a deserter, a debauchee, or a criminal. They are even more careful than is the civilian who hires a cook, an hostler, or a messenger. Naturally, as we wish it to be, the army is a conservative body; and, in the hands of the President, a preserver of order. In times of rebellion; in hours of mob-law and riot; in brief, during all dangers to the Republic from within or without, its history is a most flattering one.

When there was doubt as to the result of the Presidential election in the case of Tilden and Hayes, intense excitement prevailing and revolution appearing imminent, Grant's despatch, so coolly written in Philadelphia, not only exalted him, and honors his memory, but it showed us that ultimate reliance may be placed in the army when our Government is in extreme internal peril. An extract from this despatch will remind us of the event:—

"PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 10, [1876]

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN,
Washington, D. C.

Instruct General Augur in Louisiana and General Ruger in Florida to be vigilant with the forces at their command to preserve peace and good order, and to see that the proper and legal boards of canvassers are unmolested in the performance of their duties. Should there be any grounds of suspicion of fraudulent count on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

either side, it should be reported and denounced at once. No man worthy of the office of President should be willing to hold it if counted in or placed there by fraud. Either party can afford to be disappointed in the result. The country cannot afford to have the result tainted by the suspicion of illegal or false returns. . . . Send all the troops to General Augur he may deem necessary to insure entire quiet and a peaceful count of the ballots actually cast. . . .

U. S. GRANT."

In my humble judgment, therefore, we cannot do better for the country than to honor and improve our regular army, and to make it what it ought to be,—in form a model, and in size not too large, but large enough to meet the requirements.

OLIVER O. HOWARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GROWTH OF RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the last century a stone-mason belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was tried and, I believe, excommunicated for helping to build an Episcopal church. The charge against him was based upon precepts in the Old Testament prohibiting the erection of altars to pagan deities in the high places of Israel. It is not more than a hundred years since, in this country, Alexander Campbell, the founder of the denomination popularly called, from his name, "Campbellites," having been caught in a furious storm in Pennsylvania, was refused shelter by a devout Presbyterian woman because he was a Baptist. Her conscience compelled her to resist the hospitable inclinations of her womanly heart; for did not St. John say, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed"? A prominent Methodist clergyman of this country told me recently an analogous experience occurring only thirty-nine years ago. He was asked by the deacon of a Congregational church to deliver an address in the church on a Sunday afternoon—not at the hour of regular service—on the subject of temperance. The minister objected because the young man was an Arminian. "I agree with him on the subject of temperance," said he, "and if the meeting is held in the hall I shall go to hear him; but if we can invite an Arminian to speak in our pulpit on temperance on Sunday afternoon, what is to prevent our inviting him to preach in our pulpit on Sunday morning? And if he should preach his Arminianism, what would become of the doctrines of our holy religion?" The lecture was delivered in the town hall instead of in the church; and the Calvinistic minister went to the town hall to hear what he would not allow uttered in his pulpit. It is certain that no one of these incidents could occur in this year of grace 1897: it is difficult for us to understand how they could have occurred fifty or a hundred years ago.

What change has taken place? And why? What has caused it? And in what direction does it point?

In one aspect of the case, it would appear that denominationalism

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has increased in the last three-quarters of a century; in another aspect, that it has greatly decreased. The first foreign missionary organization in this country was undenominational. The purpose of the founders of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was to make a society so broad that all evangelical Christians could unite in preaching the Gospel to the heathen. Now, every denomination has its own missionary organization. The first Christian publication society was undenominational. It still exists, but is weakened by the fact that every denomination has its own publication society. Denominational machinery has been multiplied. The tendency has been toward sectarian organization in Christian work. But, with this tendency, has been another to make the work itself more Christian and less sectarian. Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, do their work by denominational agencies; but the work is undenominational. No longer do Arminians and Calvinists bombard each other from their respective pulpits. A sectarian sermon is rare, even in a Roman Catholic or a High-Church Episcopal pulpit; and a sermon levelled against another sect is still more rare. The churches are separated; but the doctrine is one. The reader can easily satisfy himself of the truth of this observation. Let him take up a Monday morning's paper and read the reports of the previous Sunday's sermons, and then endeavor, without any acquaintance with the preachers, to determine to what denominations they respectively belong. Or, if he have acquaintance with the preachers, let him analyze the sermons, and endeavor to designate to himself the features in any sermon which are characteristically Presbyterian, or Congregational, or Baptist, or Unitarian. Except in the utterances of a few polemical divines,—relics of a past age,—he will find it difficult so to do. Ministers preach in denominational pulpits; but they proclaim one and the same Christian message.

Nor is it because either school has converted the other. The Episcopalian is still a Churchman, and the Congregationalist an Independent; the Arminian still believes in free-will, and the Calvinist in Divine sovereignty. Nothing is settled. But the interest in these questions is gone. They are not, as they used to be, the themes of conversation in the social circle, nor the subject of sermons by popular preachers, nor even the topics of debate in ecclesiastical assemblies and clerical gatherings. Now and then someone is put on trial for doubting or denying some doctrine expressed or implied in the standards of the church. But generally this is not really because of his doubts or his denials of a theological formulary, but for some other reason. Her-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

esy is the charge; but the real ground of offence is something quite different. Or, if some survivor of an ancient epoch prefers a charge of heresy against Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall in Brooklyn, or Dr. John Watson in Liverpool, the accuser is unsupported and the charge promptly tabled. What has taken place is not the settlement of old controversies, nor an increase of the spirit of toleration for error. Indeed that spirit is of doubtful value. He who loves the truth cannot well be tolerant of error. He who respects himself will hardly be content to be tolerated by a self-constituted judge of his opinions: he who respects his neighbor will hardly be content to tolerate him as a preacher of falsehood. Intolerance of error is the negative pole of enthusiasm for truth; and, in general, the intensity of the one is in the direct ratio of the intensity of the other. The mistake of the Scotch Presbyterian, of the Pennsylvania Presbyterian, and of the New-England Calvinist was not that each was intolerant of vital error, but that the first identified Episcopacy with paganism, the second regarded Campbellism as anti-Christ, and the third considered Arminianism as oppugnant to the doctrines of our holy religion.

Two changes have taken place in the life of the church, both of them for the better, though doubtless accompanied, as all such changes are, by some adverse circumstances. First, the public interest has been transferred from theological to ethical problems,—that is, from problems in the philosophy of religion to problems in practical conduct. Second, we have grown more catholic, that is, more large-minded; have come, or are coming, to see the difference between truths and the truth, and to perceive that none of us possesses *the* truth, and that our neighbor possesses some fragment of truth which we ourselves have failed to possess. In other words, we are coming to recognize the fact that each one of us knows but in part and prophesies in part, and that only by putting these various parts together can anyone secure the whole. This will perhaps appear more clearly if we attempt briefly to trace the historic process and the causes which have coöperated in it.

The Unitarian revolt against Puritanism, which characterized the beginning of the present century, was not merely nor mainly an endeavor to substitute one dogmatism for another. It was in part a protest against a too mathematical and scholastic doctrine of the Trinity, —a protest which, it seems to some of us, rejected, with scholastic formularies, some valuable and vital truth. It was an affirmation of the inherent dignity and worth of man, and a repudiation of the dogma of "total depravity"; in repudiating which dogma, it also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seems to us, the Unitarians have sometimes ignored or belittled, if they have not denied, the organic sinfulness of man as a racial fact. But, more than either, it was a protest against the measurement of life and character by theological standards, and the substitution therefor of standards purely ethical. His repudiation of dogma as a measurement of character, rather than his repudiation of any particular dogmas, was the distinguishing characteristic of William Ellery Channing's contribution to the religious life and thought of New England. His followers may sometimes have attempted to substitute a new dogma in the place of the dogmas which they discarded; they may sometimes have failed to see that no ethical laws are effective which are not vitalized by a spiritual life; that no spiritual life is possible apart from God; and that no fellowship with God is possible without some recognized manifestation of Him to the soul. But these must be regarded rather as the incidents, if not the vagaries, of the Unitarian reaction; certainly not as constituting its permanent contribution to the religious life of the church. That contribution consisted partly in its simplification of religious truth, partly in its correcter estimate of man, partly in its more rational interpretation of the Bible, but most of all in the emphasis which it placed on such fundamental declarations as, "Ye shall know them by their fruits," and "Every one that loveth is born of God." I cannot think that the Unitarian system of theology, so far as it can be said to be a system, will survive; but its insistence on a simplicity of faith and on a substitution of ethico-spiritual for dogmatic tests of character has made itself felt in every Christian church. And this substitution of a vital for an intellectual test is gradually, but surely, taking place in all denominations.

This revolution in public sentiment has been greatly expedited by contemporaneous events. Intensity of interest is rarely felt by any individual, and never by any community, in two different themes simultaneously. At the time when people began to grow weary of scholastic theology, and when the Unitarian divines began to insist upon other themes as more real and vital, moral reformers, non-theological and non-ecclesiastical, appeared upon the scene to urge such themes upon the public attention. The great Washingtonian movement swept over the country; first Dr. Lyman Beecher, then Mr. Hawkins, then Mr. Gough, furnished a new theme of public interest; men and women continued to go decorously to theological churches; but their interest was transferred from theology to temperance. This was straightway followed by the great anti-slavery agitation. Preachers who continued to serve out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to their churches dilutions of Jonathan Edwards on original sin or the freedom of the will preached to listless congregations, whom it would be untruthful to call auditors: the preachers who filled the churches with eager listeners were the gradually increasing number who spoke of the rights of the enslaved and the duties of the North. Preachers of righteousness appeared also outside the churches; and the lecture-platform and the public convention gave to the people what, in too many places, the ministry, not awake to the changed conditions, failed to give, —instruction in the application of the Golden Rule to the problems of the hour. When the Civil War broke out the one question, how to preserve the nation, took precedence of all other questions. It was impossible to interest fathers and mothers in curious scientific hypotheses concerning the adjustment of Divine decrees to human freedom when the congregation were eagerly waiting for news from Fort Donelson or Vicksburg, Gettysburg or the Wilderness. The problems of speculative theology, once driven out of the public mind by the more vital problems of human liberty and national existence, never could go back again into their old place, and never will. For the close of the War and the enfranchisement of the slaves were followed by other ethical problems, which, if not so exciting, were not less complicated and difficult. The relation of the religious to secular education in the public schools, the reform of politics, the purification of our great cities, the various aspects of the labor question, the duty of the American citizen toward the incoming foreign population, both in town and country,—these and kindred questions demand the attention of the citizen. And the citizen in turn has demanded from his religious teachers some elucidation of principles which will help him to solve these problems righteously and rationally.

It is perhaps questionable whether we are much more tolerant of each other's opinions on such questions as these than we were a century ago: whatever arouses our interest and excites our zeal also stimulates our passions and our prejudices. But the old questions no longer concern us. The minister who desires to interest his congregation must speak to them on questions in which they are interested; and these are not the old-time questions in speculative theology. He may still preach theology, that is, a science of religion; but it must be a science which can be applied in the reconstruction of society on a Christian foundation. The minister of to-day who rants politics is no better than the minister of the olden time who ranted revivalism: he may not even be so useful a member of society. But the follies and vices

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of pulpit exaggeration serve to illustrate, as well as its better phases, the nature of the times and of the public demands upon the pulpit.

With this transfer of public interest from theological to ethical and spiritual problems has gone a radical change in the nature of the theological problems which interest thoughtful men and women. Darwin's "Origin of Species" was published in 1859. Almost instantly evolution, which had previously been a theory interesting cloistered students only, became a problem interesting the public and discussed in the periodicals, the journals, and the social clubs. The theological disputants of the eighteenth century all accepted, as a final authority, the words of the Bible. Not so the theological disputants of the nineteenth century. If evolution is true, the world was not made in the manner described in the first chapter of Genesis; nor man in the manner described in the second chapter; nor did sin come into the world in the manner described in the third chapter; nor was the so-called Mosaic Code, moral and ceremonial, all given by divine authority on the Mount at one time and through one man. Spiritual authority is in process of transference from the Bible to the reason and the conscience of men, as it had before, for Protestants, been transferred from the church to the Book.

If, in a company of twenty divines of to-day, a theological discussion be started, the theme will be connected with the adjustment of evolutionary theories to traditional theology: one portion of the disputants will stand by traditional theology, surrendering reluctantly, if at all, the traditional positions; the other portion will frankly throw over the old traditionalism and will be found reconstructing their ethical philosophy, their theological system, and their Biblical criticism on an evolutionary foundation. Arminians and Calvinists, Episcopalians and Independents, Baptists and Pedo-Baptists, will be found in each section. In other words, while the old dogmatic lines remain to divide the denominations, the real lines, which divide men in their vital theological sympathies, are wholly undenominational. Men who subscribe to the same theological creed are theological opponents: men who are in opposing theological camps are in reality theological allies. There is very little opportunity for denominational intolerance when the Episcopal Prof. Batten, the Presbyterian Dr. van Dyke, the Congregational Prof. Curtiss, and the Baptist Prof. Rhees combine in one book, expounding the application of the principles of the New Criticism to the Bible, and become a common target for Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist critics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One other element in our national life has also contributed largely —possibly more largely than all other causes combined—to make the age theologically tolerant; namely, our public-school system. It is impossible for us to estimate what has been and is the effect of this system in teaching the American people that character and life are more than dogma, and that no church has a monopoly of that religion which promotes virtue. When a Roman-Catholic boy has been captain of a High-School nine or eleven, and has depended for school victories, which were much dearer to him than prizes or scholarships, upon the fidelity to duty of a Protestant companion, it is impossible for him to believe that his Protestant playfellow is doomed to eternal torment because he has not been confirmed in the Catholic communion; and it is equally impossible for the Protestant to regard his captain as a child of the Scarlet Woman and a citizen of the modern Babylon. These boys, in learning to respect each other, learn to respect each other's religion,— or at least to realize that the defects in each other's creeds are not such defects as are fatal to honorable character. They come to see that there is some truth in all creeds, and some virtue in all communions. The process is the more efficacious because it is both gradual and unconscious, and because its result is not so much toleration for each other's vices and errors as respect for each other's virtue and intelligence.

Thus, while we are growing more indifferent about speculative theories and more interested in ethico-spiritual principles, we are also growing, not so much more tolerant, as more catholic. Each one of us is learning that he does not "know it all." We are beginning to perceive that truth is infinite and the individual mind finite; and we are less satisfied with our own partialism and less dissatisfied with the partial view of our neighbor. We are beginning to distrust the negations in our own creeds and to wonder if there is not some truth in our neighbor's affirmations. The Arminian believes more than he used to do in Divine sovereignty, and the Calvinist more in human freedom; the Baptist more in the family as the unit of all social organization, and the Pedo-Baptist more in the right of the individual to choose his own form of faith for himself; the Catholic believes more in the authority of the individual conscience as the final court of appeal, and the Independent more in the Church of Christ as the corrector of the idiosyncrasies of the individual. If, in this process toward a more catholic faith, we sometimes fail to discriminate between the spiritual life and its dogmatic expression, and in our growing indifference to the second sometimes grow careless concerning the first, this must be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attributed to that infirmity of the human mind which habitually makes its growth unsymmetrical. And while we may well deprecate the tendency of theological unconcern to develop into spiritual indifferentism, while we may well be on our guard against it ourselves, and try to put others on guard against it, we may certainly see that the close of the nineteenth century is far in advance of the beginning, in the juster comparative estimate which it puts on speculative thought and practical life, in the more cautious estimate which each one puts upon his own opinions, and in the greater readiness of each to give respectful consideration to the opinions of his neighbor.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EMERSON'S "THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR" SIXTY YEARS AFTER.

THE fourth decade of this fast-flying century was a great decade. It was the time of beginnings: it was a period of newness. The westward movement of population was slowly pressing its way between the mountains and the great river and passing beyond. Mighty anticipations of mighty powers were filling the hearts and minds of men. In the middle year of the decade, Morse set up his telegraphic apparatus in his room in the University of the City of New York. Visions of wealth were filling the public eye. Values in certain lands reached a figure which they have never since reached. Reforms were in the air. Apostles of newness abounded. The Fifth Monarchy was indeed to be reëstablished. It was the age of the transcendentalists, *Redeunt Saturnia regna:* it was the age of antislavery, of temperance, of non-resistance, and "come-outism." Everybody had a mission; and, as Lowell says, his mission was spelled with a capital M. It was, too, the age of the foundation of new colleges. In 1837 the University of Michigan began a life which for sixty years has progressed in ever-enlarging relationship. In the same year Mary Lyon founded Mt. Holyoke,—a school which at that time meant more for the education of women than any college since founded meant at the time of its beginning. Oberlin, Marietta, the University of the State of Missouri, De Pauw, Wabash, and Illinois had their beginning in this same great period.

But, be it said, in the year 1837, on the last day of August, Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke at Cambridge what for sixty years has been known as his Phi Beta Kappa address. Its subject was "The American Scholar." It was the first of the great addresses which the great man made. In his published works it stands next the essay on "Nature," which was his first noteworthy volume. It was a great address. Oliver Wendell Holmes calls it our "Intellectual Declaration of Independence": we might denominate it our Declaration of Intellectual Independence. Mr. Lowell, in his essay on Thoreau, written in 1865, says:—

"His [Emerson's] oration before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some thirty years ago, was an event without any former parallel in our literary annals, a scene to be always treasured in the memory for its picturesqueness and its inspiration. What crowded and breathless aisles, what windows clustering with eager heads, what enthusiasm of approval, what grim silence of foregone dissent! It was our Yankee version of a lecture by Abelard, our Harvard parallel to the last public appearances of Schelling." [1]

For two generations this oration has been the intellectual bread for college and other folk. Like so many other first addresses and works, it seems to be a microcosm of the whole message which the great author subsequently thought or spoke. He who would be moved by the best of the early Emerson must stoop and drink of this early and steadily flowing spring.

What are the influences which form the scholar? —that is the first question which Emerson asks. They are, is the answer, nature, books, and action. What are the duties of the scholar? They are, it may be answered, all comprehended in self-trust. Allied with this duty, or as applications of it, are the duties of trust in humanity, and in American humanity in particular. Such is the simple address, which, as Mr. Lowell says, "was an event without any former parallel in our literary annals." But the whole discourse, it is apparent, was given with such sweetness of manner, such deftness of phrase, such delicacy of allusion, with so broad a sweep of knowledge and such suggestiveness, with a flash-light power of illustration, and all with so clear a revelation of fundamental principles of being, that the oration made the man illustrious, and his message like the rising of a new sun.

It is important perhaps to study this oration in the light of the sixty years which have passed since it was spoken.

The nature which Emerson notes as one of the formative influences of the scholar is quite unlike the nature which the scholar of the present hour studies. To Emerson nature is a condition lying open to the inner eye and to the outer, splendid and infinite. Nature is the reflection of the scholar in the sky, earth, air. Its beauty is the beauty of his own mind. Its laws are the laws of his own mind. Nature thus becomes to him the measure of his attainments. So much of nature as he is ignorant of, so much of his own mind does he not yet possess. And, in fine, the ancient precept, "Know thyself!" and the modern precept, "Study nature!" become at last one maxim. But, to the scholar of to-day, nature has ceased to be simply a condition, and has become a material for his study. In the year before that in which Emerson was

[1] Prose Works, Vol. I., 366–7.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaking, Charles Darwin had returned from his voyage in the "Beagle" round the globe, and was being moved with those suggestions which were soon to revolutionize the world's thought. Agassiz was giving his days and nights, his money and the money of his friends, to his great work on fossil fishes. To the naturalist, even at that time, nature was ceasing to be a condition, and was beginning to be a great laboratory: not so much, too, was she becoming a place for study as an object to be studied. Since that time nature has become split up into many departments for our observation. We have no longer scientists; but we have chemists, and of several sorts; we have biologists, and of several types,—physiologists, morphologists, botanists; we have physicists, and of several sorts. Like the ancient Osiris, nature has been hewn into a thousand parts. But even with this division we have come to see the unity of nature. The doctrine of the origin of life, existing in manifold forms, the doctrine of the conservation of energy, are doctrines of a day that has dawned since 1837. To Emerson, nature was a comforting and inspiring condition: to us, nature has become a material existing in diverse forms, one in substance, sufficient for the observation and experimenting of the children of men for the endless cycles. This element in nature of forming material for observation and study is represented in the training which a foreigner, who came to these shores ten years after the Phi Beta Kappa address was spoken, gave to young naturalists. Every teacher knows that description of Agassiz throwing away text and text-books and putting the student down alone at the table with a fish before him, and telling him day after day to look at his fish. Nature is the material itself: its flowers are no longer for beauty, but for analysis; its stars are no longer for inspiration, but for observation; its fish and fowl are no longer for admiration, but food for knowledge and material for classification.

The second influence touching the scholar, says Emerson, is books. Books represent those forces of the past which pour themselves most vitally into the present. What are books for? Books, says Emerson, "are for nothing but to inspire." Books still are one of the few great motive forces. Books still inspire. Books that are the "life-blood of a master spirit," books that are vital, books that are born of life and in turn create life,—such books, breathing, give breath to flagging men; they are reservoirs of vital forces, whence flow streams of life into thousands of men without losing their own supply. Such books are as constant as the stars, fragrant as the flowers, ample as life, and as deathless as humanity. But a change in the use of books

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has taken place, not unlike the change which has occurred in the conception of nature. The book, like nature, has become material for the scholar's use. These records of the past are stuff for the clear understanding and exhibition of truth. It is not without significance that the shield of our oldest college consists of a wide, open book with "Veritas" written across its pages.

Every age makes its own books, as every bird makes its own nest each season. Every age takes the books of the past ages and makes them over for its own use: every age sings its own poetry, tells its own stories, writes its own history. Dryden sings not for the critical, interrogative, doubting nineteenth century, but for the light-hearted, pleasure-loving, gay, sparkling Restoration. Tennyson sings not for the courtiers of Charles II, but for the large-hearted, large-brained, sober-minded men of the sixty years of the great Queen's great reign. Fielding does not write for our age, nor Hawthorne for the age of Fielding. Hume's History belongs to the eighteenth century; summing up two mighty tendencies toward individualism and naturalism. Macaulay's volumes belong to the middle of the nineteenth century, when the great Whig movement had greatest power and was in fullest sway. Green's vigorous and compact volumes belong to the last quarter of the century, when not movement, but life, is the chief concern of man. But each of these—poet, story-teller, or historian—uses all the past, bringing into his own work whatever treasures he can gather out of the storehouse of the limitless yesterday.

When one asks the question, What have American scholars done in these sixty years through the recreating for this generation of the materials of the past? the answer is not a ground for boastfulness. In the single field of classical philology, Germany has gone as far beyond us as we have gone beyond our forefathers. The cloistered nooks of Oxford and Cambridge have also given us results in which the world rejoices. As we in America call over the list of those who have cultivated the field of classical study, we name Gildersleeve, Goodwin, Seymour, Hale, Allen, Wright, Warren, and White; but each of them would say, that not a few German scholars have gone beyond any one of their own number.

The last of the three great forces which the great Phi Beta Kappa orator names as influencing the scholar is action. Action with the scholar is subordinate; but it is essential. Without it he is not yet a man, without it thoughts can never ripen into truth. He who puts forth his total strength in fit action has the richest return of wisdom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If it were only for a vocabulary the scholar should be covetous of action. Life is our dictionary. Life lies behind us as the quarry whence we get tiles and copestones for the masonry of to-day. The final value of action, like that of books, and better than books, is that it is a resource. Such are some of the words by which Emerson suggests the value of action in forming the scholar.

The importance of action to the scholar has, since these words were spoken, received illustration more forcible than could have seemed possible in 1837. It is significant that the largest university in the world, the University of Berlin, was founded when Germany lay in humiliation at the feet of the ruthless Napoleon. It is also significant that the first rector of this same university, the great Fichte, wrote his deathless work on the destiny of man when Germany seemed to have no destiny, except to be bound to the chariot of a Corsican adventurer. It is also still more significant that the most important act passed for the higher education in America, after the Ordinance of 1787, was the Morrill Act of 1862, giving millions of acres of land for the endowment of the higher education in certain States of the Union, passed at a time when there was doubt whether there was to be any Union. Full of meaning is it that we call a battle an action, as if a battle were the fullest, most vital form of action. The poem which I presume most would agree is the greatest poem written in this Western Hemisphere was written and read to commemorate the college boys who fell in the greatest of all civil wars:—

> "Many loved Truth, and lavished life's best oil
> Amid the dust of books to find her,
> Content at last, for guerdon of their toil,
> With the cast mantle she hath left behind her.
> Many in sad faith sought for her,
> Many with crossed hands sighed for her;
> But these, our brothers, fought for her,
> At life's dear peril wrought for her,
> So loved her that they died for her,
> Tasting the raptured fleetness
> Of her divine completeness . . ." [1]

The man who heard someone calling, "Sumter is fired on, Fort Sumter is fired on," and replied, "What do I care, I must finish my Greek lesson," was neither scholar nor patriot, neither Greek nor American. He lacked the element of humanity, he lacked the supreme factor of

[1] JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL'S "Ode recited at the Harvard Commemoration, July 21, 1865."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life, he lacked the capacity to do,—element, factor, capacity which belong to scholarship.

The great war did much for the American people. It is possible that the lapse of time may prove that the freedom of the negro is not the greatest of all the great war's sociological benefits. Rather do we not already see and feel that the supreme contest was a clarifying of the intellect, a quickening of the conscience, an arousing of the will, a stirring of the heart, whence have come the splendid material advance and the noble intellectual movement of the last generation of this wonderful century? Emerson was right, not only for sixty years, but for sixty times sixty years, when he said that action helps to make the scholar.

It is worthy of note that Emerson does not refer to another influence that moves the scholar; though to this force he does refer in an address given at Dartmouth College the following year. It needs only to be mentioned to be recognized as the greatest power in the life of the scholar as it is in the life of all men,—the power of personality. Personality, to which nature is cold matter; personality, to which the book is only a weakened copy; personality, of which action is simply an application,—personality is undoubtedly the greatest power in the scholar's life. Take down the names of great men, of scholars, of men great in any department, and read them over one by one, and you will find that personality is the power greater in the constituting of these great men than nature, than books, than action. It was one college teacher who trained Emerson, Lowell, C. F. Adams, Hedge, A. P. Peabody, Felton, Hillard, Winthrop, Holmes, Sumner, Motley, Phillips, Bowen, Lovering, Torrey, Dana, Thoreau, Hale, Thomas Hill, Child, Fitzedward Hall, Lane, Higginson, and Norton. It was not method only, although method had its value; it was not atmosphere, although atmosphere had its value; it was not nature alone, although nature had its worth; but it was the character, personality, life of Edward Tyrrel Channing which helped to make American literature.

I sometimes think, that in our quest for a man to sit in our chairs of instruction and to convey knowledge, we are prone to think more of the chair of instruction than of the man who sits in it and who gives the instruction. We inquire with care into the academic biography of the academic candidate; but do we inquire with sufficient care into the vital, formative, ethical, manly, and man-making power of the soul which teaches and inspires? The college was made to make men,—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make men through scholarship and personal association. Let us therefore have scholars; but let us also have each scholar a man; let us have both a man who is a scholar and a scholar who is a man; let us have a scholar who was a man before he became a scholar and who is a man after he becomes a scholar.

Emerson does not forget to tell us what is the duty of the scholar. The great thinker is ethical. This duty, like the formative power, is threefold. This duty is also a unit. The one word describing this duty and these duties is "trust." This trust has three applications: to the man himself, to universal man, and to the American man. The duties therefore are: self-trust, trust in humanity, and trust in American humanity.

Sixty years have brought no change in the duty of self-trust on the part of the American scholar. The duty is not less obligatory than it was in 1837; nor have the forces that tend to weaken the scholar's trust in himself at all weakened. The increasing splendor of material treasure, the shining mark of material aims, the larger affluence of wealth, the heightened pride of place, have rather made the duty of self-trust the more imperative as they have made it the more difficult to obey. Not the idols of the markets nor the idols of the forum are to tear the American scholar from his supreme belief in the power of thought or in the dominance of culture. His voice may be still and small; but it will be heard when the storms and whirlwinds of public passion have ceased. He is to have the confidence of Garrison, crying: "I will be as harsh as truth and as uncompromising as justice; I will not equivocate; I will not excuse; I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard." Not in a boastfulness which betokens weakness, nor in violence which may indicate unsoundness, but in sheer simple, quiet self-trust; knowing he is right, and then proceeding forthwith the right to do, is the scholar to live his life and to do his work in the "great Task-master's eye." The scholar is to have the self-trust of Milton, but he is to have more than Milton's gentleness; he is to have the self-trust of Cardinal Newman, but he is to have more than Newman's spirit of investigation; he is to have the self-trust of Carlyle, but he is to have it free from egoistic rules and impositions. He is to hold himself to his principles, assured that the greatness of thought and of feeling, of scholarship and of knowledge, is like unto the mountains, to which he can ever lift up his eyes and be at peace.

The scholar is also to trust men. He is to be a democrat. Not to trust men is intellectual and ethical suicide. Not to trust men is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burn down the house in which the scholar lives. The scholar is to look on humanity as his child, as his brother. Mistaken in intellectual vision, false in premises of reasoning, wrong in method, preferring the ugly to the graceful, the cheap to the worthy, the ephemeral to the eternal, man may be; but the scholar is to know that such errors, sins, or crimes are not the errors, sins, and crimes of an alien, but of one who is of the same blood as himself. He is, therefore, to seek to correct the offender's vision, to refine his tastes, to turn his will toward righteousness, to expel his preference of sin and to quicken his life. Man is at times and in spots selfish; but trust him. Man is at times and in spots evil; but trust him. Man is at times and in spots fallen; but trust him. His fall is the fall of an angel; his evil is the evil of a saint; his foolishness—if foolishness it be—is the foolishness of delirium, which, passing away, leaves the man in his right mind. Let the scholar trust humanity!

The American scholar is also bound by the special obligation of trusting his own brother of the same name as his own. The American man has done much for the American scholar. No more impressive evidence can be found of the value of the service that the American man has rendered the American scholar than is offered in the scores of colleges founded in the new commonwealths. From the college on the bank of the Kennebec to the college at the Golden Gate, colleges present proof that to the good-will of the American citizen do they owe their being. At times one is inclined to indulge himself in a mood of complaint; for the entire value of all our colleges, including buildings and endowment,—the result of more than two and one-half centuries of gathering,—is hardly in excess of certain private fortunes. Yet, at a time like the present, let us rather sing our song of gratitude to the benefactor of the American college than mournfully chant our Greek chorus of complaint over human selfishness. Surely the American man has done more for the American scholar than the men of other races have done for their agencies of the higher learning. The Englishman desires to found or to perpetuate a family: he seldom gives to those indigent and ivy-covered creations of elegant leisure on the banks of the Cam and of the Isis. The German looks to the government to endow Strasburg and Berlin. The American democrat desires to equip his college out of his own private chest. Millions and tens of millions of dollars are pouring into the treasuries of our colleges from private and personal beneficence. More is now given in a single year to American colleges than had been given to all American colleges in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two hundred years between the founding of Harvard and the day of Emerson's address. Such a record the world has never made. Trust the American man to endow American scholarship!

Sixty years ago Emerson said, "We have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe." The remark was at once true and false when it was made: the remark is now at once truer and falser than when it was made. In 1837 Everett and Bancroft and Ticknor and Longfellow had listened to the courtly muses; but they had not listened too long. Men, too, born abroad, whose work was to be in no small degree in America, as Francis Lieber, Louis Agassiz, Guyot, Charles Beck and Charles Theodore Follen, had also listened to the courtly muses; but they had not listened too long. Within the years soon to follow 1837, Lane and Child and Goodwin of Harvard and Gildersleeve, together with Gould, the astronomer, and Whitney, were to listen to the same courtly muses; but they were not to listen too long. In the last forty years hundreds upon hundreds of Americans have listened to the same strains; but no one of us dares to say that the period of listening was too long. For the truth is, that scholarship cannot be made too rich, nor the training in and for scholarly pursuits too noble. It is moreover a fact, that scholarship knows no territorial boundaries: learning is not provincial. We cannot send too many young men to Europe, provided Europe can make them better scholars than we ourselves can make them.

We are obliged to confess that the great scholars of the world are the scholars of Europe. When one calls over the names of great scholars of the last sixty years one does not find many American names. Take the great chemists of the last sixty years and whom will you name? Liebig, Dumas, Laurent and Gerhardt, Wurtz, Williamson, Hofman, Kekule, Pasteur, Bunsen, Mendeleef, Stas, and Ostwald. So also when one asks for the names of the great biologists of the last sixty years one names: von Baer, Max Schultze, Agassiz, Darwin, Huxley, de Bary, Dorhn,—of which only one is American, and he by adoption.

It is in physics that the last sixty years manifest as noble a service as in any realm of scholarship. Joseph Henry greatly resembles Faraday both in the methods and in the quality of his work. Henry's discoveries in electro-magnetism were valuable additions to those of Faraday. To him is also due much of the honor connected with the development of the telegraph. American science owes to him also a large debt for his executive work in the establishment of the Smith-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonian Institution. The present Director of the Smithsonian Institution, Prof. A. P. Langley, is probably the first living authority on radiant heat, and especially the heat of the sun. The most brilliant of American physicists is Prof. Rowland; and his career since his undergraduate days, when he discovered a new method of magnetic measurement, has been one of increasing worth. But while no one of these three men would claim to be so great an experimenter as Michael Faraday, nor so great a genius as James Clerk Maxwell, nor so eminent as Lord Kelvin, nor so conspicuous in several scientific fields as von Helmholtz, yet they deserve to rank with the great physicists of the middle period of the century.

In a list of the great philosophers of the last sixty years Schopenhauer, Lotze, and Spencer should be included; not a few would add Comte; and a few, Hamilton. American books on philosophy are usually well written; but in general they lack depth and comprehensiveness. The great men in logic of this period are either Englishmen or Germans; although one should perhaps mention the work of Charles Peirce. When one thinks of the great ethical scholars of our time, the names that first occur to one are those of Englishmen,—Spencer, Green, Sidgwick, Stephen, and Martineau. In psychology, however, while one thinks of Wundt, Külpe, Maudsley, Galton, Ward, Carpenter, Ribot, and many French specialists, yet one does not forget James, Ladd, Hall, and several other Americans.

Let us not be ashamed if we have not the scholarship of Berlin and Bonn, of Leipsic and Munich. Let us not be ashamed if we have not the rich culture of Oxford and Cambridge: let us frankly confess that we have not. Let us confess to ourselves that the Germans far excel us in scholarship. Frank confession of this sort is a prerequisite to making ourselves great scholars.

For, above all else, America has the future. If we have in two hundred and fifty years, or in sixty, made few great scholars, we may believe that in the new century we may make many great scholars. The spirit of scholarship is moving on the vast and yeasty deep of knowledge and reflection. Great results we may be able to achieve in brief time.

One of the most significant features of the Greek civilization is the swiftness of its rise. A period hardly longer than lies between the entrance of the "Mayflower" into Plymouth Bay and the landing of the Atlantic Cable on its shore divides the morning of Greek civilization from its noon. In a period hardly longer than has been the life of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oldest college, Æschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles sang their great anthems of human destiny, Plato thought, Aristotle reasoned, Praxiteles and Phidias made the rock beautiful and vocal. In that brief time came into Greece, and through Greece into humanity, a beauty and a strength which are at once the glory and the despair of men. In the coming century let us hope that American civilization may rise with a swiftness akin to that which Greek life found after the Persian wars; let us trust that American civilization may rise with a beauty like that which flowered forth into Greek architecture and sculpture; let us be able to believe that it may rise with a might and majesty worthy too of the Western conqueror of the Greek; but let us pray that American civilization may rise with a permanence of beauty, of might, and of majesty which neither Greek nor Roman life knew.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EVOLUTION OF THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAL.—II.

In the preceding article, the evolution of the educational ideal was discussed from a historical standpoint. In this paper, I shall direct attention to the present and future aspects of the subject.

Upon the whole, it may be said that education is at present still under the influence of the civic-humanistic ideal. Nevertheless, there are tendencies discernible which foreshadow the end of its dominion. There are evidences of an internal disturbance such as that which preceded the Reformation and the French Revolution. The belief in the old ideals is shaken: new conceptions of the dignity and culture of man are beginning to gain ground.

In the present century two tendencies become conspicuous: tendencies which may be classified as the popular and the realistic.

The popular tendency is distinguished by two prominent characteristics—the national and the democratic: education is to emanate from the national life itself; and all classes of the people are to enjoy the benefits of the intellectual life of the whole nation.

(1) The national characteristic is found in all countries of Europe: everywhere the tendency to the nationalization of education is manifest. This circumstance is undoubtedly due, in a very high degree, to the nationalization of the state itself. The most remarkable characteristic of the political life of the nineteenth century is undoubtedly the formation of great national states. The example afforded by the political unification of the states of Germany and Italy has aroused the national instincts of other nations, and influenced the policy of their political leaders. The political dynasties of the eighteenth century, with their marked indifference to the nationality of the subject, have been supplanted by the modern states, which so jealously guard the national idea.

This change in the political life has influenced education in two directions. The idea of instilling national views and national culture into the minds of the pupils everywhere pervades the common schools. For this reason, instruction in history and the mother-tongue are considered of vital importance. A hundred years ago the religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

element was predominant in Germany: to-day the national element is considered of equal importance. But the common schools have a still greater task to perform; namely, the assimilation of the foreign elements residing within the country,—an idea which was unknown at the beginning of the century. The little state of Denmark took the initiative in this respect, in endeavoring, through the schools, to make Danish territory of the Duchy of Schleswig. Although unsuccessful, the example of Denmark has been followed upon a very extensive scale. At present Germany is endeavoring to Teutonize its Poles, Danes, and Frenchmen by means of the school; Hungary and Russia are endeavoring to Magyarize and Russify their Germans, Poles, and Roumanians. It cannot be said that these efforts have so far been successful; indeed, it must be admitted that they have been baneful to education and culture where, as in the East, they have aimed at the extermination of the superior races. I fear they have been so everywhere.

It is undeniable that a broad and truly humane culture is best propagated upon native soil, where the mother-tongue is spoken. At present much time is spent in attempts to impart a slight knowledge of the foreign tongue to unwilling pupils, who rapidly forget it. Were it not better to rely upon the persuasive power of self-interest and a superior culture? Furthermore, may it not be said that the contrast of nationalities in one and the same state is frequently advantageous as a means of mutual improvement? Such is the case in Switzerland and the United States; while Alsace was a serious loss to France, not merely in a political, but also in an intellectual sense, owing to the benefits which the foreign nationality contributed to the French life.

Nationalization also exerts its influence in the gymnasium. In every country of Europe, national education is gradually forcing classical education into the background. Here also we have a proof of the growing sentiment in favor of national worth and dignity. The modern races no longer permit their own nationality to be subordinated to that of classical antiquity. Men of learning, more particularly those who act as teachers and leaders of the people, are expected to be closely identified with the nation itself.

For a long period this was not the case. During many centuries the exclusiveness of scholarly culture was a matter of pride. The humanistic poet of the sixteenth century regarded his native language—the language of the peasant—with contempt. The foreign language gave him a sense of exclusiveness and dignity. Even in the schools

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he instilled into the minds of his pupils, with the elements of Latin, a contempt of the common people and their language. The rod was the punishment for speaking in the mother-tongue. In the same manner was the Courtly-French culture anti-national and unpopular. The foreign tongue gave to "polite society" a sense of superiority, as it occasionally does to-day. The civic-humanistic education became incensed at the foreign bearing of "polite society"; it desired to be national and independent of French influence. This is not an unimportant moment in the new humanistic movement. The influence of the antique is placed against that of the French. To learn from the Greeks, the schoolmasters of the whole world, is not so humiliating to the national consciousness as to recognize the superiority of a neighboring nation.

In other respects, however, the humanistic gymnasium has not tended to diminish the distance between the exclusiveness of the scholar and the national life. The old Latin schools taught Latin as the language of the scholar, a rather superficial possession: the new gymnasium advocates classical education as a means of bringing about a transformation of the inner life,—a human Renaissance by means of Greek culture. Consequently, those who are not Greeks are but partially human. This estrangement of the scholar from the people was again a source of pride and exclusiveness. Many felt that a person unfamiliar with Latin and Greek was not an equal and was scarcely worthy of serious consideration. Since about the middle of the present century, a reaction against this scholarly exclusiveness has made itself felt. We find a proof of this in the wave of indignation against compulsory Latin which swept over the country in 1848. This reaction has become much stronger within the past generation. The victory which the reactionary movement achieved in neighboring countries is now also assured in Germany. The curriculum for 1892 shows a departure from the old method. Instruction in the dead languages has been greatly abridged; writing in Latin has been entirely abandoned; even the elementary instruction in this language is not begun until the pupil has attained a more mature age (about the twelfth year). On the other hand, instruction in German is strongly emphasized; indeed, the student whose knowledge of this language is unsatisfactory is not entitled to his degree. Furthermore, pupils of schools in which Latin is not taught (the so-called *Oberrealschulen*) are now permitted to enter the university. Thus we see that the rule of classicism is broken.

I shall devote merely a few words to the similar movement which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is now noticeable in the fields of art and literature. Its most striking feature is a departure from the classicist idealism, which, together with the new humanistic movement, established its rule at the beginning of the century. Everywhere we notice the endeavor to pursue independent paths. Realism in literature is a strong protest against conventional classicism. The same is true of the new symbolism, whose dramas emphasize an idea, whose fairy-tales involve a philosophical truth, etc. The tendency of our time, like that of the seventh decade of the eighteenth century, is to create new forms and to give expression to new ideas. Architecture employs all styles, ancient and modern, in order to give an appropriate architectural expression to the sentiment of the times. In painting, the elements of light and color are considered of greater importance than drawing. Even in sculpture, color has been introduced; a proceeding which fifty years ago would have been considered sacrilege. The discovery has since been made, however, that, as regards tinted statuary, the Greeks themselves must have been barbarians.

(2) I have mentioned the democratic tendency as a second feature of the popular movement. I use the term "democratic" to designate the tendency to allow every individual to take an active interest in the national life. This is a very conspicuous characteristic of the educational ideal of the nineteenth century. The pressure exerted by the lower classes has been met half-way, and has resulted in enormously augmenting their power.

This improvement in the condition of the masses has been brought about by the reorganization of the common school. The enlightening ideas of Pestalozzi have served to change the reading, writing, and memory schools into a popular educational institution. The Teachers' Seminaries (Normal Schools), a large number of which were founded toward the close of the last century, are to the masses what the universities are to the upper classes: they equip their teachers with a fund of scientific culture and pedagogical training. In this way, the common schools, besides giving instruction in the three R's, are enabled to supply their pupils with a general knowledge of history and physics, which may serve as a basis for future development. Germany was the first country to entrust the general education of the people to the care of the state. The great victories of Prussia proved conclusively that the augmentation of national power was due largely to her broad system of education. The well-known saying, that the victory of Sadowa was won by the Prussian schoolmaster, though somewhat one-sided, is par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tially true. It is an undeniable fact that the superiority of the German army was due principally to the general culture of all its members; for even the subaltern officers were graduates from the common schools. In like manner, the extraordinary economical advance of Germany during the past generation, which now begins to exert its influence upon the neighboring countries, may be traced to her universal system of education. At the same time the development of city life—a necessary consequence of the greatly improved economical conditions—has facilitated attendance at the schools and promoted the desire for improved educational methods.

This entire movement resulted in giving the masses a far greater interest, both political and intellectual, in public life. There can be no doubt that the masses which, toward the close of the eighteenth century, were still characterized by dull passivity, have now awakened to a lively interest in public affairs. They read and think: they have not merely an extensive daily press, but a complete scientific literature as well. Works on social and natural science, philosophy, and history, which are written for the masses and reflect their views, are bought and read to an extraordinary extent: even in the remotest workshop these books may be found. Whatever the intrinsic value of these writings may be, the very fact of their existence is a proof of the greatly increased intellectual activity of the masses.

There can be no doubt of the mutual relation between the political and the intellectual improvement of the masses. Equipped with the privilege of universal suffrage, which, perhaps, was not originally given to them for this purpose, the masses are already beginning to exercise a considerable influence upon public life; an influence, however, which is not at all commensurate with their aspirations. Whether they are qualified as yet to exercise the right of suffrage, which they acquired rather suddenly, is somewhat doubtful. Above all, they still lack a proper appreciation of the solidarity of national interests. For the time being, class differences have forced the sentiment of national unity into the background. I refer here more particularly to the socialistic agitation. It may be assumed, however, that a stronger pressure from without would rapidly sweep all the international oratory (or demagogism) out of Germany, and establish a spirit of unity among the people. The self-preservation of the nation, the security of its vital interests, and the maintenance of its political power are the first conditions necessary to the prosperity of the lower classes. A decline of political power, which would soon be followed by an economical deterioration, would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at once recoil upon the laboring population. On the other hand, it would be well to realize more clearly than is often the case that the prosperity of the masses is the indispensable condition of national greatness. The commercial and military serviceability of the people naturally proceeds from their material, moral, and intellectual welfare; while oppression of the masses would be synonymous with a deterioration and decline of the entire nation. To substantiate this, it is necessary to consider only the probable effect of oppression upon the education of the growing generation: an impoverished and downtrodden proletariat cannot produce offspring physically and morally healthy. Whenever the social question is discussed this should not be forgotten. Indeed, the question may be briefly formulated as follows: Amid the altered conditions of life and production, how can we make it possible for the masses to rear a strong and useful progeny?

Upon the whole it may be said that the impulse from below has been answered from above, and that the upper classes have lent a willing hand. At the beginning of the century the leading circles, more particularly those of Germany, manifested a desire to disseminate culture among the people. I would especially recall to mind the spontaneous and passionate interest with which reformatory measures—those of Pestalozzi, for example—were everywhere received. Crowned heads, statesmen, and scholars all displayed extraordinary zeal in encouraging and stimulating the movement. It was this spirit which gave birth to the common schools of Germany. Later on, a certain conservatism set in. The old nobility occasionally manifested a disposition to adopt the maxim which von Rochow, a pedagogical reformer of the eighteenth century, who was himself a Brandenberg nobleman, professes to have frequently heard expressed by men of his class: "The peasant must remain in ignorance; otherwise he cannot be held in subjection." In recent years similar opinions have occasionally been uttered by the *parvenue bourgeoisie* in reference to the culture of the industrial classes. However, this narrow-minded policy has not succeeded in checking the efforts of the statesmen and intellectual leaders to raise the standard of culture among the lower classes. Schools and societies for the advancement of higher culture are also working in the same direction. Even the churches have everywhere begun to participate in the movement by means of societies, lectures, the press, etc.

Noteworthy also are the efforts recently made by the universities to come into touch with the educational needs of the people. In the Scandinavian countries the so-called "Peasants' High Schools" have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

established since about the middle of the present century, to propagate culture among the middle and lower strata of the peasantry; and the results attained have been very favorable. In countries where the English language is spoken, the universities (since 1870) have endeavored to make education accessible to those who desire self-improvement, but are prevented by reason of their daily vocations from taking a regular scientific course. In Germany also the universities are about to follow this example; and I do not believe that the bugaboo of "superficial education," which is occasionally raised in the newspapers by the representatives of "thoroughness," will intimidate them from carrying out their design. As matters stand, I consider it of far greater importance to bring about a mutual understanding between the educated and the uneducated classes than to protect the latter from the effects of a superficial education. Wherever the desire for knowledge exists, it is sure to seek sources of information; and the universities may certainly entertain the hope of supplying sources fully as good as those which are supplied to the masses from other quarters. Together with the lectures of which I have spoken, the public libraries may be mentioned. As regards the latter, however, the English-speaking nations, for several decades, have made a considerable advance.

I have mentioned the realistic tendency as the second general feature of the educational movement of our century. It is obvious that this tendency also stands in close relation to the general current of the times. In discussing this feature, I shall first dwell upon realism in politics, and then direct attention to the same phenomenon in the sciences.

Politics, toward the close of the last century, had an ideal tendency. The French Revolution, in its origin, was a purely idealistic movement: philosophical ideas, ideas of natural rights, were to be verified, and then communicated to all mankind for their salvation. To a still greater degree did the German race live in the realm of ideas; dreams of a universal republic, a human Arcadia, an everlasting reign of peace occupied the minds of its sages and poets. Napoleon I was the first great practical statesman who awakened the German nation—rudely enough, it is true—out of the realm of dreams. Not by word, but by deed, he inculcated the lesson, that a people, in order to preserve their independence, must unite for their defence. He pointed out to the German people the necessity and the signification of the state, the symbol of which is power. That the German nation well understood the lesson, was demonstrated by the uprising of 1813. The enthusiastic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth of that period suffered in the cause of German power and unity. They recognized the necessity of these ideals, although their realization was far distant; until at last Bismarck, the second great practical statesman of the century, appeared, and, with the weapons of practical politics, blood and iron, reared the structure of the Empire.

The spirit of mind engendered by these events exercises its sway over many circles. The desire for power is the maxim of the time. Political questions, whether of a foreign or domestic nature, are questions of power, not of doctrine. Some go still further and declare that every question relating to public affairs is to be regarded from this point of view: that of our social life, the labor question, for example, is "one of power, which some day will be fought out upon our streets." Even questions relating to the church are now treated in this sense; as, for example, in Rome, where practical statecraft has ever had its seat from the days of Romulus to those of Leo XIII. Even the politically constituted Protestant churches, with their parties, electoral primaries, terrorism, etc., are to-day dominated by the same idea.

The scientific movement of the nineteenth century, in many respects, runs parallel to that just mentioned. The words of Bacon, "Knowledge is power," were never so highly valued as at the present day. At the beginning of the century, the aim of science was to afford an insight into the mystery of the world and of life. Faust's magical endeavors and the speculative philosophy indicate the goal. Physical science rules to-day; and her aim is not contemplation of the world, but the mastery of the physical forces. The interests which these tendencies denote are embodied in medicine and technical science.

All this affects education and the spirit of the youthful generation. The changes in the general constitution of our educational system since the end of the eighteenth century may be briefly summed up as follows: (1) Beside the old humanistic school-system, a realistic one has sprung up: polytechnical institutes and industrial schools of every description have found room beside the Latin schools. (2) Despite strenuous opposition, a realistic course has gained admission into the old schools, and now occupies a place beside the old linguistic and humanistic course; as, for example, in the gymnasium, where mathematics and physics have advanced at the expense of the classics. In the common schools, also, religious instruction has been compelled to yield more and more room to scientific subjects.

Doubtless the spirit of our youth is in accordance with the general movement: it is centred in action and power. What has become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the æsthetic, sentimental spirit with which the youth of one hundred years ago read the works of Homer or the dramas of Goethe and Schiller, which had just then appeared? Where is the passionate enthusiasm and wonder with which the audiences of that time received the revelations of Fichte and Schelling? The young people of our day take an interest in North-Pole expeditions, travels in Africa, bicycles, aquatic sports, and the like. To obtain recognition in the outer world, is the enthusiastic endeavor of the younger generation: strength, bravery, and dominion are its ideals. And our schools promote this aim. Gymnastic exercises, which everywhere constitute an important element of education, direct the attention to bodily health and vigor and to the art of self-defence. Here, also, the desire for power is stimulated; while games and sports, which always require bodily strength, are greatly encouraged. Indeed, the sports of our pupils occasionally transcend the proper limit, and threaten to interfere with their intellectual interests. I wish also to refer here briefly to the movement which has been set on foot to develop the manual dexterity of our pupils. This movement, emanating from the North, has rapidly found friends and patrons in other countries.

At this point, as at many others, the popular and the realistic tendencies are in touch. Naturally the great masses rarely come in contact with a spiritual culture of mind; therefore, all bodily exercises, all physical efforts at work or play lessen the disparity between the upper and the lower ranks of society, establish a better understanding between them, and frequently lead to common activity. I should consider it fortunate if the course devoted to manual training should reëstablish the ancient prestige of hand-work, and eventually gain for it a higher appreciation among the upper classes. On the other hand, it would be a valuable acquisition to the national life if the gymnastic exercises and sports of our youth could once more be enjoyed in common by the people at large. In this way our laboring classes, who, even at work, are rarely brought into close relation, would once more become enabled to congregate for the purpose of mutual enjoyment on workdays as well as on holidays.

In conclusion, I shall touch upon a third tendency which has lately become somewhat conspicuous. It may be termed the individualistic tendency.

This tendency differs in some respects from those already mentioned. The popular and the realistic tendencies may be regarded as the predominant influences of the period: the individualistic movement is a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reaction against a partial result of these influences; viz., the extension and increase of state control in the regulation of the life of the individual. This latter tendency is particularly evident in our educational system. The school system is, in an ever greater degree, becoming subject to state management. State inspection and control of the schools are really a development of the nineteenth century. Prior to that, education was entrusted to the family, the church, or the city. The effect of the present system has been to define education more clearly and strictly to systematize it. The examinations have become more and more exacting and stringent as regards details. If we compare, for example, the present plan of instruction for the Prussian high schools with the plans previously drawn, we shall find that the curriculum is remarkably explicit, even as regards the selection of the authors to be read in each class.

The regulation of the studies, however, is not confined to externals. The teacher must not merely follow a precise method, but he is also required to direct the views and sentiments of his pupils. Instruction in religion, history, and German is imparted with the ulterior aim of giving a definite direction to thought and sentiment. According to the Prussian curriculum of 1892, instruction in history must give the pupil an idea of the serious consequences which follow sudden and violent changes in the social order. The counterpart to this is found in France—for example, in the "Instruction Civique," by Paul Bert, a former Minister of Instruction. In this work the French Revolution is styled "the sunrise of humanity on earth, the first great and glorious revolution in the destiny of mankind, which has emancipated the masses and raised them from poverty to affluence"; while monarchy and priesthood are characterized as the hereditary foes of the people. The tendency of both these methods is virtually the same; namely, to instil certain opinions and sentiments into the youthful mind.

This is certainly not a new tendency. It is but natural that the older generation should endeavor to inculcate its own view of right. The influence of the state, however, in this regard is new. Formerly the home and the church were powerful agents in moulding the views of the growing generation. To-day the bureaucracy exercises the *selectus opinionum*, and dictates those ideas and sentiments which have met with its sanction and approval. It is from this point of view that we must study the so-called individualistic tendency: it is the reaction against the correctness enforced by the state.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This tendency is a well-defined characteristic of recent literature. Everywhere we hear the indignant protest against "conventional correctness" and the fetters which it imposes on personal life and thought. In Germany, Paul de Lagarde and Friedrich Nietzsche have been the most pronounced opponents of this "conventional correctness." Lagarde's "Deutsche Schriften" are one continuous protest against the slavery which church, state, school, and general education alike impose on the individual; and Nietzsche, also, is a standing contradiction to all that "obtains," to all that is generally recognized as "correct." From the "Untimely Observations" to the "Dusk of the Idols," he unceasingly inveighs against the faint-hearted herds of educated fogeys, who, in consequence of their long-continued and very correct schooling, have lost all the strength and moral courage requisite to personal independence,—who dare not express or even entertain an idea which is not sanctioned by the authorities, the schools, or the newspapers. In contradistinction to this altogether too numerous class, he places the individual, who, strong and courageous within himself, attacks the citadel of "correctness," and remodels the traditional standards of value and morals; in short, the absolute revolutionist. In all this we recognize that spirit of contradiction which is opposed to all that is generally accepted as "correct."

Nietzsche is perhaps the strongest exponent of this literary-philosophical-anarchistic spirit,—a spirit which is not confined to Germany, but pervades all the countries of Europe. Everywhere we find the spirit of revolt against the old truths and ideals. Tolstoï—the Russian Rousseau of the nineteenth century—preaches a kind of sentimental anarchism. The state, with its compulsory service, its wars, and its official bodies, with their laws and regulations; the church, with a conventional belief which has nothing in common with the Gospel; the sciences, which have long since lost all faith in themselves; a society which torments itself and imagines itself to be happy,—all these conditions oppress the individual and debar him from recognizing natural truths. From the North comes Ibsen preaching the same word. He declares that the individual is strongest alone, and that the world is full of conventional falsehoods from which the veil should be torn. Kjelland, the Dane, sings the same tune. Confined from infancy within a network of narrowing ideas, man becomes tame, small, and distorted. To begin with, Latin grammar and composition at once deprive him of the power of natural speech, the Catechism deprives him of the courage to think independently; so that, by the time his confirmation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes, his tongue unhesitatingly utters what his heart does not understand. Finally, the state examination approaches, and he passes the narrow portals of "perfect correctness," to become an official of the state. And now, as a member of polite society, he thinks and says nothing but what is deemed proper and respectable. Whoever wishes to be a unit, and to indulge in the luxury of expressing independent ideas, is at once excommunicated: society ostracizes him and expunges his utterances. Thus the principle of the "survival of the fittest" is gradually altered into the survival of the weakest and the most "correct."

These are the men who have caught the public ear to-day, whose books are widely read and translated into all languages, and whose plays are everywhere performed. In all, we find the love of the uncommon, the longing for something new and original. Yet this love is frequently succeeded by the scorn and hatred which they cherish for all that bears the official or "officious" stamp of the state and society. At the same time it is questionable whether the ability of these men to recognize the reality of things and to create new ideals is not surpassed by their power of invective. I incline to the belief that the latter is the case, and that their invective frequently culminates in abuse. Nevertheless, it is a noteworthy fact that the public lends a favorable ear to these writers: there must be something in the spirit of their productions which attracts it. I am of the opinion that this spirit of revolt is the result of the excessive tension produced by our conventional "correctness."

These ideas are further emphasized in the political and social discontent of the masses. Lassalle belongs to those who despise the educated rabble whose education consists in the complete absence of independent thought, who know something about everything and who have cut-and-dried opinions on every subject so long as they take their partisan newspaper regularly. This scornful tone is a conspicuous feature of the whole socialistic literature. And now, opposed to this, we find a real or feigned belief in every species of authority, which is occasionally intensified into a veritable fanaticism of "correctness." Where this extreme prevails all independence of thought is mercilessly condemned. "Whoever differs from ourselves, who are conventionally correct, on political, social, ecclesiastical, or other questions; whoever does not acquiesce in all that we do or say, is in league with the enemy and is a traitor. It were best to turn him out into the marketplace and stone him at once." This is the cry which is daily sounded by the newspapers of the "correct" class.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I hasten to my conclusion. Let us place ourselves apart from the tumult which rages on both sides, and, closing our ears, question ourselves whether a new educational ideal may be evolved from this strife of contending factions, and what the general character of this ideal would be. If we assume that the three features which I have mentioned may be combined, we should have a popular-realistic-individualistic ideal of education. Popular, not exclusive or aristocratic in the narrower sense of the word; national, not foreign or international, but rather the result of an evolution from the national life itself; realistic, characterized by strength and action and not by mere thought and æsthetic sentiment; individualistic, *i. e.*, aiming at the development of the individual and not at the establishment of dull uniformity; not democratic, therefore, if this word imply a general reduction to a dead level, but rather aristocratic, in the sense of an individual, not a class, aristocracy.

It would be presumptuous at the present day to state what the concrete form of such an educational ideal would be. I wish to say, however, that the society corresponding to the above ideal would be that of an aristocracy of mind. Is this the type toward which we are leaning? Is the aristocracy of birth and wealth to be supplanted by the aristocracy of personal worth and merit? This has been the philosopher's dream, from the day of Plato's "Republic" to the present hour. It is the tendency of nature. It would be the aristocracy of nature to have every individual stand independently upon his own personal merit and not upon the achievements of his father; while the influence of heredity, in the sense of the transmission of personal characteristics, would certainly not be diminished. Such is the aristocracy to which historical development seems to point. Both church and state have made considerable advances toward the realization of this idea of a personal *élite*, by bestowing position and influence according to the degree of personal talent and efficiency, without regard to birth and possession.

Will the future follow this path? Will a time come when the prosecution of this idea, once the idea of the liberal democracy, will be vigorously resumed? Will the tendency toward conventional correctness, apathy, and idleness be eventually overcome, in order that the ideal of personal liberty may be carried to a higher degree of perfection than has been possible during the nineteenth century? It is impossible to foretell. The future is the land of belief and not of visible reality. Still, it must be admitted that ideas have been a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power in history; for, by gaining an influence upon the imagination, the phantasy, and the will, they gradually become converted into facts. As the ideal of education it will remain: each according to his natural endowment. This is as true of the individual as of the community at large. It is a misfortune for the individual and a serious loss to the community, when the methods of education and their practical application to actual life are at variance. If the educational standard is inferior to the natural capacity of the individual, a feeling of ungratified desire and humiliation is engendered. If, on the other hand, the educational demands transcend the native ability of the individual, we find, as a result, superficiality of culture, over-education, false education, or whatever that prevalent disease of our time may be termed, which afflicts so many human beings, who, destined by nature to fill a subordinate position, are continually tormented by their excess of culture.

Thus we have returned to that educational ideal which filled the soul of the youthful Wilhelm von Humboldt, and which John Stuart Mill so warmly advocates in his essay on "Liberty": Vigor and originality, not equality, nor that uniformity which disregards the demands of nature; for this produces weakness and false culture. Let us extend to every individual the liberty of developing his talents according to the demands of his nature, in order that he may reach the summit of his capacity. But let us not forget that, in the words of Kant, "we are here discussing an *idea* to which experience furnishes no parallel." Enough for us if this idea give a direction to our will. Life itself will certainly modify it.

FRIEDRICH PAULSEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT OF BERLIN.

BERLIN is situated on the sandy plains that form the valley of the Spree, which winds its sluggish course through the city and makes connection with the fertile valleys of the Elbe and the Oder; thus joining the commerce of Eastern Europe with the North Sea and the Baltic. The river Spree, outside the city, spreads into a shallow stream, frequently widening into broad lakes; but within the city it is reduced to the proportions of a large canal, and is confined by walls of solid masonry. With it are connected several canals, which facilitate the transportation of heavy freight, and indeed serve as a means of traffic between different points within the city; thus relieving the local streets and railway traffic. Regular local freight-boats ply on the Spree from station to station for the transfer of freight. This extensive system of inland water traffic—greater than that of the Rhine—has been potent in building up a great commercial city.

But more powerful in city-building than a convenient waterway are the influences of war and politics. The fact that the Hohenzollerns chose Berlin as their home has been influential in making it one of the great cities of Europe. Its fortunes have followed the ascending star of this illustrious family. When the small town of Berlin-Köln fell into the hands of this thrifty family it began to improve. Under the impetus given it by Frederick the Great it took rank, in 1786, with the capitals of Europe. As the centre of the Prussian monarchy its opportunities for growth were enhanced; and since the close of the Franco-Prussian war, as the capital of the new empire, its advancement has been marvellous. At the beginning of this century the population of Berlin was 172,000; in 1870, it numbered 800,000; while at present it is nearly 2,000,000. From 1870 to 1890 it grew more rapidly than New York, kept pace with Chicago, and made twice as much progress as Philadelphia. With this rapid growth of population many problems of municipal government have arisen, which have been met and solved so wisely as to challenge admiration at almost every point. While, in attempting to solve the problems of city government in the United States, it may not be wise to think of imitating the government of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Berlin, the methods of administration in every department there yield most valuable lessons.

The long military discipline that made Prussia an independent state and, later, gave it the most perfect system of administration in Europe has had its effect on city government. The force of that excellent method of administration has become the inheritance of the modern municipal system. Government is a serious matter in Berlin; and the Germans bring to bear upon it all their great powers of organization and execution. The power of concentrated action, the thoroughness of social institutions, the seriousness with which all governmental acts are regarded, the scientific method of managing public works, the patient and exhaustive treatment of every subject in hand,—all have contributed to the perfection of the great German capital. While the Germans were very slow in taking up the problem of municipal government, the qualities just enumerated have enabled them, in very many respects, to take front rank.

The municipal government of Berlin, and in fact of all other Prussian cities, is founded on the general law of 1808, established through the influence of the reformers Stein and Hardenberg, which gave the municipalities enlarged powers of local government. Since then the constitution has been changed, notably in 1877–1884; and the old laws have been completed, revised, and adapted to the new conditions. The local government has always remained intact, and has been much stimulated by these reforms; but the powers of the Imperial government still extend to the municipality.

At present the central organization of the government of Berlin consists of a city council, composed of one hundred and twenty-six members elected by the qualified voters of the city. There is a property qualification for voters based on the class system. This excludes from the privileges of voting about 15 per cent of those who would otherwise be qualified. Those who are eligible to vote are divided into three classes according to the amount of property owned, which is determined by the amount of taxes paid. Each class represents one-third of the aggregate amount of taxes paid. The city is divided into electoral districts; and each class in each district elects a member of the council. The first class comprises a few wealthy voters; the second, a large number of well-to-do people; and the third is composed of a much larger group consisting of small property-holders and laboring-men. This system favors property rights, and places the balance of power in the hands of the wealthy. While this method seems to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans—who have been accustomed to look upon the elective franchise with greater liberality—to be arbitrary and unjust, it is not without merit. It recognizes at once that the city is a business corporation, and gives those members having the greater business interest, and who pay the larger proportion for the support of the government, the greater power in choosing representatives. While in other instances this excess of power might prove dangerous, in Berlin its use is enlightened and directed in the best interests of the people.

The city council becomes almost a perpetual body. Its members are elected for six years; one-third being chosen every two years. Men are reëlected repeatedly for good service; and many spend a large part of their active lives as members of the council. This gives a permanence to its acts and a stability to its government, which could not exist with a rapidly changing membership. The council chooses its *Ober-bürgermeister* and *Bürgermeister*, who, in many respects, correspond with the mayor and deputy-mayor of American cities. The council may go outside its own membership, and indeed outside its own city, to choose these officers. But the choice is always subject to the approval of the Emperor,—a reservation that does not seem to have been exercised with arbitrary power.

The especial working-force of the council consists of thirty magistrates, chosen from the membership of the council by its own vote, subject to the approval of the Governor of the Province of Brandenburg, in which the city of Berlin is situated. These magistrates do not sit as members of the council, but in a separate chamber. The council and magistrates are not, however, in the relation of a lower and an upper house; for all the standing committees are chosen from the council at large, including both magistrates and non-magistrates. The magistrates pass all laws for the government of the city. The council, in its sittings, acts as a deliberative body, and may present matters for the consideration of the body of magistrates; but it may not pass laws. Fifteen of the thirty magistrates are paid officials, experts in their particular lines, who are chosen on account of their fitness to carry on administrative work. They spend all their time in the service of the city, for which they receive salaries ranging from $1,750 to $3,750 per annum. These members fill important positions on the various standing committees; the most important being those on buildings, streets and roadways, sanitation, hospitals and drainage, lighting, cleaning, water-supply, parks, markets, common schools, care of the poor, police, and finances. These committees do the great work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of city government, each furnishing a report of its specific department. It will thus be seen that the public functions of the city are great: the expenditures are consequently large. The corporation expends annually more than $20,000,000 for the government; which is not excessive, when it is considered that part of the revenue is derived from the proceeds of public works, such as water, gas, slaughter-houses, and markets. The successful conduct of so large a corporation requires much business ability. Everything is so closely accounted for, and the records are so fully published, that a rate-payer may obtain at any time a true statement of the business condition of the municipality.

The police regulations of Berlin are under the supervision of the royal power. The chief of police (*Ober-präsident*) is a royal officer, who has control of the entire system. The main body or ordinary policemen are supported by funds derived from state taxes. They have the charge of enforcing all municipal laws and rates, the management of all licences, the overseeing of street traffic and travel, the abatement of nuisances, and the bringing to justice of all offenders against the common weal. In addition to the regular police there are night watchmen, who are paid by the city, and are employed especially for the care of property. The system is carefully organized; and every precaution is taken to insure protection to property and person.

In Berlin every person is expected to keep his place; and he usually does so. If out of place, he is not long in finding it out through official notification. On entering the city,—even for a short residence,—persons must make a declaration of age, nationality, place of birth, residence, domicile, and occupation, and must state expressly the purpose for which they have come to the city. On leaving, they must also make a declaration as to whither they are going and for what purpose. Even guests at the hotels make out on arrival a similar statement, which is delivered to the police. This makes it possible to locate any resident in the city within a few minutes.

A great many people complain of German officialism, which is obnoxious to their sense of freedom. Indeed there is a saying that it is considered a misdemeanor to laugh in Berlin. Certainly there is a reverence among German officers for even the letter of the law which is frequently carried to an annoying extent. Yet careful inquiry shows that this arises more from a desire to perform a duty conscientiously than from mere snobbishness. In no other country is the devotion to duty so evident as among the serious, law-adoring Prussians. While affairs move slowly, they move surely; and it can be depended upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that everything needful will be done, and that no mistakes will be made. Every department of the city government exhibits thoroughness and honesty. Men in office are public servants,—which in Germany means that they are to serve the public and not especially themselves and their friends. If lofty ideals of justice and of the majesty of law and order, devotion to duty, and a reverence for the letter of the law lead to a little over-officialism, it should be readily excused.

The methods of communication in Berlin are excellent. The postal system is exceedingly prompt and accurate. In addition to the regular service, there is a subordinate system for carrying small parcels and heavy mail at a cheaper rate. For this purpose separate boxes for depositing packages are established at convenient distances. A convenient device for the transmission of letters is the pneumatic tube, by means of which letters are sent rapidly from one station to another. These, together with the public telephone and telegraph, make the means of city communication complete.

The facilities of travel in Berlin are fairly good. Cabs are still much in evidence, there being about 8,000 registered in the city. The system is excellent, the rates moderate. A very good horse-car system is still in use, electricity having been only partially introduced. The horse-car company performs its work under a city charter with many limitations. It is held to strict accountability in everything. To prevent accidents, the car-lines have regular halting-places or stations at which passengers take the cars. These stations are usually at a short distance from cross-streets. Each car is allowed to carry only a limited number of passengers,—just so many as can comfortably sit within, or stand on the platform. Each car bears a plain inscription designating the number of seats and standing-places; and when the car is full the conductor is not allowed to take on more. This prevents overcrowding, and forces the company to provide an ample supply of cars.

The elevated railroad is built across the city, curving to stations in the most important localities. This connects with a circuit or belt-road which joins the most important suburban towns to the city. These roads are well built and exceedingly well managed. They do an enormous business; the ordinary fare being the same as the horse-car fare; viz., two and one-half cents.

One is impressed with the thoroughness of all public constructions, whether erected by the city directly or by the companies obtaining a franchise. In the construction of street railway-tracks, a solid foundation is made, upon which is laid cement six or seven inches deep, made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfectly smooth at the surface. Upon this are laid heavy rails seven inches high, which are connected by iron bands securely bolted, thus making the road one continuous piece of iron. About the rails is laid more cement, which is brought nearly to the top. Finally, a layer of asphalt brings the surface of the road exactly even with the top of the rails so that a carriage may cross without any jar. As the top of the rail is double, the wheels of the train run in a groove; and this, with the firm foundation, enables the cars to travel without jolting or noise.

The maintenance of streets is carried on with the same thoroughness. The streets of Berlin are well-constructed and kept in perfect repair. As much care is exercised in the construction of a street as by a carpenter in making a table, or a watchmaker in making a watch. The result is that, with a good foundation and perfect construction, the road lasts a long time. Nearly all the streets are of first-class asphalt. A large proportion of the remainder are of granite blocks about eight inches square. These are laid on a solid, smooth foundation; sand is driven into the crevices, and, finally, melted asphalt is poured in, cementing the whole together in an impervious layer.

The repairing and cleaning of streets are carefully provided for. The smallest seam in the asphalt or the slightest unevenness in the granite pavement is immediately repaired. Nearly all the repairs on the principal streets are carried on at night. Pieces of pavement that would be called good in New York are taken up and new pieces are laid. This is true economy; for it prevents the street from reaching a state of decay. The streets are cleaned by day and by night. Everywhere in the daytime are to be seen the uniformed army of street-cleaners. The sweepings are placed in openings at the sides of the streets, and are carted away at night. After eleven o'clock, sweeping-machines are used on some of the principal streets. The asphalt is sometimes flooded and swept with rubber brooms until it is as clean as a kitchen-floor after scrubbing-day.

The sanitation of Berlin is complete. Rigid rules are enforced with reference to garbage and sewage. Large quantities of disinfectants and deodorizers are used by the city, and furnished to private individuals free of charge. A perfect system of sewerage is maintained, which conduces greatly to the public health. From the different parts of the city the water from closets, baths, and kitchens, as well as the surface-water of the streets, is conducted through a system of sewers to central stations along the Spree, situated at the lowest elevation of the city. Here the sewage is collected in large central reser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voirs. From these reservoirs it is forced by means of large pumps through great iron tubes into the country. It then passes into central stand-towers and is thence distributed, through a system of irrigation pipes and ditches, upon the land. Thus the sewage of the city becomes the fertilizer of the land, which produces fruits and vegetables for city consumption. The soil upon which the sewage is thrown is a sandy loam, quite pervious to water. Hence when the sewage is deposited, the soil acts as a filter, retaining all the solid particles and allowing the water to pass off in a comparatively pure state. A system of underground tiling is used to collect the water and return it again by small streams into the Spree. The use of antiseptics and disinfectants, and the contact of the sewage with air, sunlight, and soil remove all unhealthful conditions from the sewage-farms. The people who live on them are unusually healthy; and the hospitals of Berlin have established convalescent homes upon the farms. The peasants drink the water after filtration without any evil effects.

Before the adoption of the present system of canalization, the people of Berlin lived in much discomfort, being subject to the ravages of all sorts of contagious and miasmatic diseases. The city had rapidly grown without furnishing the means of comfort, or even common decency, to the people. But since 1875 the health of the city has improved at a ratio almost constant with the increase of the sewer system. The total death-rate has declined from 30.9 to 18.47 per thousand. The death-rate by typhus fever has been reduced from 7.7 to 0.69 per thousand.

Were Victor Hugo now living he could not complain of Berlin, as he did of Paris, that the sea is impoverishing the land by drawing off its fertilizers; for drainage in the former city yields a revenue. The city sewer system transports annually from 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 cubic metres of sewage for distribution over the broad acres lying seven to fifteen miles from the city. The area of the fields irrigated is more than 20,000 acres; or greater than the present area of the city, which is twenty-five miles. The total cost of the drainage system is about $25,000,000; and it is estimated that it will take $5,000,000 more to complete it. Yet, owing to the enormous yield of the irrigated land, it will soon return a revenue on first cost, and pay for the investment besides. As many as five crops of hay are cut in a single year; and several crops of vegetables are obtained each season.

The sewage-fields are divided into three classes: first, the most fertile fields, which are let out to market-gardeners, who supply fruits and vegetables to the city; second, the less fertile fields, suitable for raising

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vegetables and grains, and partly rented to peasant farmers and partly exploited by the city; third, the poorer lands used for grazing purposes and for hay. These are kept wholly under the management of the corporation, and are rapidly becoming more valuable through fertilization, cultivation, and general improvements.

One of the excellent features of the sanitary system of Berlin is the establishment of public lavatories at the corners of parks and at the intersection of thoroughfares. They are a great public convenience, and indeed are indispensable to the health and comfort of the people of any modern European city. These well-built and scrupulously kept institutions are managed by women. The accommodations are of two classes, first and second, for which are paid two and one-half and one and one-fourth cents respectively. In the first-class apartments soap, towels, comb, and brush are furnished. Perhaps this custom of providing lavatories has arisen on account of the conditions of the densely populated cities of the Old World, where different ideas of modesty and cleanliness from those in our own country prevail. At any rate, if the provisions for cleanliness and comfort are of such avail in Berlin and other European cities, they should also be of value in American cities. Small as it may appear, there is no feature of the sanitary government of Berlin that adds more to its health and comfort than this one.

The water-supply of the city is ample and pure. In 1873, the municipality, obtaining control of the water-supply, began to build a new system. Elaborate plants were established for taking the water from the broad, shallow lakes of the Spree and the Havel. The water is conveyed to the filtration-fields, where it is made pure by sand filtration. The process of filtration is mechanical, chemical, and bacteriological; so that all noxious elements are extracted from it. After this it passes into reservoirs and is thence distributed to the consumers in the city. The water-supply of a city is said to be a measure of its civilization. Certainly Berlin has been amply rewarded for its immense outlay in furnishing an abundant supply of pure water, which has contributed in every way to the health and comfort of the entire city. At present the plant is able to furnish 40,000,000 cubic metres per annum. The enterprise has proved a paying investment; for the income from private consumers covers all expenses of operation, interest, and first cost, and pays into the sinking-fund more than $600,000 per annum. The city has little trouble in collecting rents, as the water is sold to consumers by meter. Nearly all the people of Berlin live in tenement flats. When a meter is placed in a house but one charge is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made and that to the owner of the house. This saves much trouble and waste, as the landlords look after the tenants.

The city is supplied with light partly by public and partly by private enterprise. The first gas company was established in 1827. In 1847, the city began to build its own plant and to compete with the private company. The result of this competition was a reduction in the price of gas of 50 per cent. The growing city furnished abundant room for the prosperity of both systems and they exist to-day in friendly rivalry. This is quite remarkable; as it has been held by some economic philosophers that a public institution cannot successfully compete with a private one. To private consumers gas is one dollar per thousand cubic feet. In 1893, the city plant, after meeting all expenses, turned a net revenue of $1,250,000 into the public treasury.

In 1893, the city granted a franchise to an electric-light company; and some of the principal streets, squares, and public buildings are now lighted by electricity. It is interesting to note, in this connection, with what care the city guards the rights of the people in granting franchises. In the first place, the company must pay into the city treasury 10 per cent of the gross receipts. It must furnish two central avenues with light at a nominal cost. Its territory of operation is clearly defined; and it is compelled to put down main wires within a short time, specified in the contract. The city may extend its street-lighting at any time at nominal rates charged by the company. The books of the company are always open to the inspection of the public officials. The company is bound by strict rules relative to the tearing up of streets and the laying of wires, and is limited to certain fixed charges to customers, which cannot be changed without the consent of the city council. And finally, the city requires a deposit for security of $42,500, and requires the company to keep a renewal fund equal to 20 per cent of the invested capital. This fund is in the form of Berlin municipal bonds, and must be kept on deposit with the city magistrates. In addition to all this, the city reserves the right to purchase the entire plant at any time at a fair valuation, as provided in the contract.

Another interesting manner in which the city manages its contracts is shown in the street-railway franchise. The city directs all new additions, and causes the company to pay a bonus for each separate franchise. The company must also pay annually into the city treasury a percentage on its gross income: this rate increases with the development of business. The minimum rate was fixed at 4 per cent; but the company is now paying nearly 8, which yields an annual payment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than $250,000. The company is bound by strict regulations respecting the cleaning and repairing of the streets over which its tracks are laid. What is most remarkable is, that in 1911 the entire plant passes into the possession of the city free of expense. It seems almost incredible that companies can flourish under such restrictions; but they appear to do so. The manner in which the city manages franchises and contracts gives evidence of financial, legal, and business ability, which contrasts strikingly with the manner in which some of our American cities have in the past allowed companies to write their own franchises.

Among the excellent features of Berlin government are the public markets and slaughter-houses. The suffering of the people on account of diseased meat caused the city to build a central cattle-market and slaughter-house, and to connect them with a thorough system of meat inspection. The entire establishment covers about twenty-seven acres. The whole area is laid in cement; and the chief building is constructed of brick and stone. Every precaution to ensure cleanliness is taken. The cattle brought to the market are fed and carefully provided for. The slaughter-house is conducted by the city; and all meats used in the city, whether of domestic or foreign origin, must be brought here for microscopical inspection. Expert microscopists are employed. Everything is carried on with characteristic thoroughness, and so arranged that there is no delay in getting the meat on the market. All butchers and dealers are greatly pleased with the entire arrangement, and have no desire to revert to the former chaotic state of affairs. The business pays the city 4 per cent on the first cost. Meat is not the only food inspected by the government. Indeed nearly everything, from beer to bread, that is manufactured in Berlin must bear the inspector's stamp before it is pronounced genuine. But the stamp once affixed, there is no question as to the quality of the article.

It is difficult to mention all the good qualities of Berlin government. The public squares and parks are greatly enjoyed by the people. The Thiergarten is a large, densely wooded park in which the Berliners take especial delight. In the summer season, its drives are filled with carriages, its walks occupied by pedestrians, its riding-roads much used by horsemen, and its immense play-grounds thronged with children and nurses. And not a leaf or flower suffers from the multitudes that wander amid its beautiful foliage. In this garden the benches are free; but in the smaller squares the chairs cannot be used until a five-pfennig piece is dropped in the slot: the chair then unlocks and can be occupied as long as desired.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The public hospitals are worthy of note. They are at present prepared to accommodate 3,000 patients. Some of the more modern are fully equipped with all recent appliances and conveniences, and are perfect in sanitation and ventilation. Eminent men, such as Virchow, Koch, and Martin, who have accomplished so much for the science of medicine, have brought the Berlin hospitals into prominent notice; but a more detailed statement cannot be given here. Mention should however be made of the excellent feature of establishing convalescent homes for patients. It was found that when patients were discharged they were too weak to earn a living, and consequently drifted into pauperism or relapsed into disease. Hence homes were established where they could work, according to their strength, until fully recovered.

In the care of the poor Berlin excels. There are few idlers in the city; and there is little poverty in sight. Formerly the poor lived in the basements of buildings; but these residences, where below the drainage-pipes, have been abandoned as unwholesome. The people are now housed in tolerable comfort. There are more than a thousand different institutions in Berlin for the care of the poor. Part of these are private and part public enterprises; but nearly all are conducted with a view to lessen pauperism,—not to increase it. One of the most interesting of all institutions is the labor colony, where men out of employment are furnished shelter and labor until they obtain permanent work.

The supervision of the erection of public and private buildings in Berlin prevents loose and shabby work and insures safe and sanitary construction. A standing law prevents the construction of buildings over five stories high, or four with the ground-floor. This gives a monotonous appearance to the streets, but insures uniformity. Rigorous laws relating to sewer connection and drainage are enforced; and a constant inspection of water-supply and drainage is exercised by the officials. Public buildings are constructed with the utmost care and thoroughness. The new Reichstag building and the City Hall are excellent representations of modern architecture.

Upon the whole it may be said that the business of the city is conducted with economy and profit. Whatever is necessary to be done is carried out regardless of expense; but there is no waste: nothing is done in the dark. Every detail of public works is planned, and every item of expense is estimated before the work begins. The plans, once adopted, are followed out with scientific exactness. Enquiring into the causes of Berlin's success, it will be found that the theory which Ameri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can municipal reformers have been urging, that a city is a business corporation and should be conducted on business and not on political principles, is everywhere in evidence. The city insists that business men shall be placed on the council, and that specialists and experts shall be in charge of the various departments. It is considered a post of honor to be elected to the city council; and prominent lawyers, eminent statesmen, and business men are numbered among its membership. Those who fail to serve after election are fined. It is interesting to observe with what zeal the members, paid and unpaid alike, pursue the work of public administration, and with what energy private citizens coöperate in city affairs. Recognizing two kinds of institutions, those that yield revenue and those that yield no revenue, such as schools and hospitals, the officials insist that the former shall pay an income and that the latter shall be conducted with economy.

Another cause of the success of Berlin is its power of administration. In Berlin, when things are planned and ordered they are done; slowly perhaps, but surely and without delay. With a perfect system of administration like that of Berlin, a city may do anything it chooses for the welfare of the people and make an eminent success of it. The amount of service which the city has undertaken is well represented in the following paragraph from Dr. Shaw:

> "The German city holds itself responsible for the education of all, for the provision of amusement, and the means of recreation; for the adaptation of the training of the young to the necessities of gaining a livelihood; for the health of families; for the moral interests of all; for the civilizing of the people; for the promotion of individual thrift; for protection against various misfortunes; for the development of advantages and opportunities in order to promote the industrial and commercial well-being of the community; and incidentally for the supply of the common services and introduction of conveniences. All this Berlin does, and does it in such a way as to earn for it the name of the best-governed city in the world."

Some think it too much governed; but, so long as the well-being of all the people is sought and maintained, so long as thrift, economy, and a perfect system of administration are maintained, how can there be too much government? Can people do too much for themselves, if everything is excellently done?

FRANK W. BLACKMAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF THE RED MAN.

OFTEN in the stillness of the night, when all nature seems asleep about me, there comes a gentle rapping at the door of my heart. I open it; and a voice inquires, "Pokagon, what of your people? What will their future be?" My answer is: "Mortal man has not the power to draw aside the veil of unborn time to tell the future of his race. That gift belongs to the Divine alone. But it is given to him to closely judge the future by the present and the past." Hence, in order to approximate the future of our race, we must consider our natural capabilities and our environments, as connected with the dominant race which outnumbers us—three hundred to one—in this land of our fathers.

First, then, let us carefully consider if Mis-ko-au-ne-ne-og' (the red man) possesses, or is devoid of, loyalty, sympathy, benevolence, and gratitude,—those heaven-born virtues requisite for Christian character and civilization. But, in doing so, let us constantly bear in mind that the character of our people has always been published to the world by the dominant race, and that human nature is now the same as when Solomon declared that "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." In our case we have ever stood as dumb to the charges brought against us as did the Divine Master before His false accusers; hence all charges alleged against us in history should be cautiously considered, with Christian charity. There have been, and still are, too many writers who, although they have never seen an Indian in their lives, have published tragical stories of their treachery and cruelty. Mothers, for generations past, have frightened their children into obedience with that dreaded scarecrow, "Look out, or the Injuns will get you!"; creating in the infant mind a false prejudice against our race, which has given birth to that base slander, "There is no good Injun but a dead one." It is therefore no wonder that we are hated by some worse than Satan hates the salvation of human souls.

Let us glance backward to the year 1492. Columbus and his officers and crew are spending their first Christmas on the border-islands of the New World. It is not a merry, but a sad, Christmas to them. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stand crowded on the deck of the tiny ship "Niña." Four weeks since, Pinson, with the "Pinta" and her crew, deserted the squadron; and last night the flagship, "Santa Maria," that had safely borne the Admiral across an unknown sea to a strange land, was driven before the gale and stranded near the shore of Hispaniola. Deserted by her crew and left to the mercy of the breakers, she lies prostrate on the perilous sands, shivering and screaming in the wind like a wounded creature of life responsive to every wave that smites her.

It is early morning. Columbus sends Diego de Arna and Pedro Guthene to the great Chief of the Island, telling him of their sad disaster, and requesting that he come and help to save their goods from being swept into the sea. The Chief listens with all attention to the sad news; his heart is touched; he answers with his tears; and orders his people to go at once, with their canoes well manned, and help to save the stranger's goods. He also sends one of his servants to the Admiral with a message of sincere regrets for his misfortunes, offering all the aid in his power. Columbus receives the servant on shipboard; and, while he listens with gratitude to the cheering message delivered in signs and broken words, he rejoices to see coming to his relief along the shore a hundred boats, manned by a thousand men, mostly naked, bearing down upon the wrecked "Santa Maria," and swarming about her like bees around their hive. The goods disappear from the ship as by magic, are rowed ashore, and safely secured. Not one native takes advantage of the disaster for his own profit. Spanish history declares that in no part of the civilized world could Columbus have received warmer or more cordial hospitality.

Touched by such tender treatment, Columbus, writing to the King and Queen of Spain, pays this beautiful tribute to the native Carib race:—

"They are a loving, uncovetous people, so docile in all things that I swear to your Majesties there is not in all the world a better race, or more delightful country. They love their neighbors as themselves; their talk is ever sweet and gentle, accompanied with smiles; and though they be naked, yet their manners are decorous and praiseworthy."

Peter Martyr, a reliable historian, has left on record the following:—

"It is certain the land among these people is as common as sun and water, and that 'mine and thine,' the seed of all misery, have no place with them. They are content with so little that in so large a country they have rather a superfluity than a scarceness, so that they seem to live in the golden world, without toil, living in open gardens not intrenched or defended with walls. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deal justly one with another without books, without laws, without judges. They take him for an evil and mischievous man who taketh pleasure in doing hurt to another; and although they delight not in superfluities, yet they make provision for the increase of such roots whereof they make bread, content with such simple diet wherewith health is preserved and disease avoided."—(PETER MARTYR, Decade 1, Book 3.)

Does not this quotation most emphatically show that the red men of the New World did originally possess every virtue necessary for Christian civilization and enlightenment?

The question is often asked, What became of the numerous Caribs of those islands? They seemed to have vanished like leaves in autumn; for within a few years we find them supplanted by foreign slaves. The noble Bishop Las Casas tells us, in pity, "With mine own eyes, I saw kingdoms as full of people as hives are of bees; and now, where are they?" Almost all, he says, have perished by the sword and under the lash of cruel Spanish taskmasters, in the greedy thirst for gold.

Certain it is that in those days, which tried the souls of the Carib race, some fled from the lust and lash of their oppressors by sea to the coast of Florida, and reported to the natives there that Wau-be-au'-ne-ne-og' (white men), who fought with Awsh-kon-tay' Au-ne-me-kee' (thunder and lightning), who were cruel, vindictive, and without love, except a thirsty greed for gold, had come from the other side of Kons-ke-tchi-saw-me' (the ocean) and made slaves of Mis-ko-au-ne-ne-og' (the red man) of the islands, which was reported from tribe to tribe across the continent.

Scarcely a quarter-century passes since the enslavement of the Carib race, and Ponce de Leon, a Spanish adventurer, is landing from his squadron a large number of persons to colonize the coast of Florida. A few years previously, while in pursuit of the fountain of youth, he had been here for the first time, on the day of the "Feast of Flowers." Then, he was kindly received and welcomed by the sons of the forest. Now, as then, the air is perfumed with the odor of fruits and flowers; and all on shore appears pleasing and inviting. The Spaniards land, and slowly climb the terrace that bounds the sea. Here they pause, planting side by side the Spanish standard and the cross. But hark! War-whoops are heard close by. And there they come,—long lines of savages from the surrounding woods, who, with slings and darts, with clubs and stones, fall upon the dreaded Spaniards. The onslaught is terrible. Many are killed; and Ponce de Leon is mortally wounded. He now begins to realize that among the savage hosts are Caribs who have escaped from slavery and death. He well knows the bitter story

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their wrong, and that this bloody chastisement is but the returning boomerang of Spanish cruelty. They flee from the avengers of blood to the ships. The report they give of the savage attack, on their return to Spain, is so terrible that years pass before another attempt is made to colonize the land of fruits and flowers.

I deem it unnecessary to explain why these peaceful natives so soon became so warlike and vindictive. Suffice it to say: "Enslave a good man and, like the wasp which stings the hand that holds it fast, he will make use of all the means which nature has placed in his power to regain his liberty." During the first century of American history, many adventurers from different European countries sailed along the eastern coast of North America,—all reporting the natives peaceable and kind when not misused.

There was a tradition among our fathers that, before the colonization of North America, an armed band of Wau-be-au'-ne-ne-og' (white men), gorgeously clad, came on the war-path from the East, reaching the Dakotas, which then extended south as far as the mouth of the Arkansas River; that they were vindictive and cruel, destroying the natives wherever they went with Awsh-kon-tay' Au-ne-me-kee' (thunder and lightning). They were looking for gold, their Man-i-to (god), and, not finding him, went down Mi-che-se-pe (the great river) and were seen no more. Those cruel adventurers, who came among us by sea and land, must have awakened hatred and revenge in the hearts of our fathers, which may have been transmitted to their children.

It should be borne in mind that several European Powers colonized this continent about the same period, among whom the English and French took the lead. Settlements were mostly made along the Atlantic coast, which was then occupied by the Algonquin family,[1] to which my tribe—the Pottawattamies—belong: they seem to have had a common origin and common language. For a time the two races lived in peace. The French in Canada seemed naturally to assimilate with our people, many of whom received the Catholic faith. In course of time there were many marriages between the two races; and we began to look upon the great King of France as our invincible sovereign: for we were taught that he was king of all kings except the King of Wau-

[1] It is estimated that at the beginning of the seventeenth century the Algonquins numbered at least 250,000. Their survivors number probably not more than 30,000. Originally they occupied nearly all that portion of Canada and the United States lying west of the Mississippi River. They suffered more from advancing civilization than all the other tribes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kwing′ (heaven). Their priests were devoted to their work; visiting all the tribes of the south and west, followed by French traders, planting the cross, the lilies, and the shield side by side. The tribes firmly believed that the land belonged to their great king who loved them and would, if necessary, fight their battles for them. With the exception of William Penn,[1] who settled Pennsylvania, the English who colonized the United States did not seem to have the tact of the French in their dealings with us. They were less liberal with presents, and apparently less united in their religious belief. They were not so successful as the French in obtaining native converts; although some good ministers, like Roger Williams, did much to unite the races in brotherhood, and thereby delayed the final struggle.

Inroads were being continually made into Taw-naw-ke-win′ (our native land); and in seeking new homes we found ourselves invading the hunting-grounds of other tribes. The warlike Iroquois of New York would not even allow the eastern tribes to pass through their country,—as a result, our forefathers seemed compelled to make a stand against the advance of the incoming race. In doing so, our villages were laid waste with fire, our people slaughtered and burned by white warriors who seemed without number for multitude. Our fathers finally gave up the contest. Some, to avoid the Iroquois, went West through Canada. Others went West through Pennsylvania, meeting in Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin, then known as Indian Territory, where we found French priests and traders, who gave us a hearty welcome, assuring us that we should remain safe with them. In course of time the English, finding the French traders posted along the western frontier, gave them to understand that the land they occupied belonged to the English, as well as the right to buy fur from the natives. Hence the so-called French and Indian War was inaugurated, in the course of which many outrages were committed on the frontiers,—*all of them being charged to the Indians.* During this war a manifold tin box of curious make was found in a large village called Wa-gaw-naw-kee-zee′, which lay along Lake Michigan, between Little Traverse Bay and the Straits of Mackinaw. The unsuspecting Indians opened it, and in the innermost box found a mouldy substance. Soon after, the smallpox—a disease unknown to our fathers—broke out among them; and O-daw-yo-e-waw′ Da-dodse-ses′ (their medicine men) all

[1] It is said that the treaty made by William Penn with the Indians was the only treaty never sworn to and never broken, and that during seventy years not a war-whoop was sounded in Pennsylvania.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

died. In fact every one taking the disease died. Lodge after lodge was filled with unburied dead. The great village was entirely depopulated. Our fathers thought the disease was sent among them by the English because the Indians had helped the French during that war. I have passed over the ancient site of this village. Its bounds are clearly marked by second-growth forests, which now cover it. It is fifteen miles long and from one to two miles wide.

Almost on the heels of this war, after France had ceded her rights to the English, came the Revolutionary war. Our people had just begun to learn that they owed allegiance to the British, who had conquered our invincible French King. They had seen the Bourbon flag taken down from the western forts, and replaced by the red cross of St. George; and they were compelled to shout, "Long live the King,—King George who rules from the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico."

We now began selling furs to our new masters; receiving in exchange dry-goods and Awsh-kon-tay' Ne-besh (fire-water), when we were called upon again to take the war-path, to aid our new king in subduing his rebellious colonies. We could not serve two masters at the same time; hence remained loyal to our new king, while the Iroquois of New York and Canada were divided. And so it was that all the dirty, cruel work of war between the revolutionists and the mother country was laid at the door of our people, whose mouths were dumb to defend or justify themselves in respect of the outrages charged against them. These outrages were generally planned, and frequently executed, by white men, as was, in after years, the Mountain Meadow Massacre, of Mormon notoriety, for which also we were persecuted and suffered untold disgrace.

I always think of my people in those days as the dog kept by the schoolmaster to be whipped whenever a child disobeyed. During the war of 1812 we were again incited through English influence to take the war-path. Proctor, the English general of the Northwest, said to our heroic Tecumseh, "Assemble all your warriors together, join forces with us, and we will drive the Americans beyond the Ohio River, and Michigan shall be yours forever." Such a promise, from so high an authority, awakened all the native energies of our being to regain our liberty and homes, for which we had been contending against overpowering forces.

The Ottawas and Chippeways of the north, the Pottawattamies and Miamies of the south, and other tribes gathered themselves together to make the last desperate effort to regain the promised land. In this war

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our cause was far more sacred to us than was the Americans' to them. They had drawn the sword in defence of *one* of their rights; we, for *all of ours;* for our very existence, for our native land, and for the graves of our fathers, most sacred to our race.

The last engagement in which the confederated Algonquin tribes fought the Americans was at the battle of the Thames in Canada, on October 5, 1813, where we and the English were defeated by General Harrison, and General Tecumseh,[1] our brave leader, was killed.

After this battle our fathers became fully convinced that the small remnant of their tribes must either accept extermination, or such terms as their enemy saw fit to give. So they sued for peace; and the American warriors, uplifted by victory, and our Algonquin fathers, bowed down by defeat, stood around the grave of the hatchet—buried forever—and smoked the pipe of peace together.

At one time I felt that our race was doomed to extermination. There was an awful unrest among the western tribes who had been pushed by the cruel march of civilization into desert places, where subsistence was impossible. Starvation drove many to steal cattle from adjacent ranches; and when some of our people were killed by the cowboys, their friends were determined to take the war-path. I never failed on such occasions to declare most emphatically, "You might as well march your warriors into the jaws of an active volcano, expecting to shut off its fire and smoke, as to attempt to beat back the westward trend of civilization. You must teach your sons everywhere that the war-path will lead them but to the grave."

[1] At the time of this battle, Tecumseh was a brigadier-general in the English army, with Proctor. I have seen in United States histories pictures of Tecumseh, tomahawk in hand about to strike a soldier named Johnson, who claimed that he shot the dreaded chief with his pistol. But I have repeatedly heard old Indian warriors say: "After the British infantry gave way, they came to an open or clear spot in the woods, and here Tecumseh ordered his men to halt and fight the Americans once more. Just then the open space was swept by American musketry; and Tecumseh fell, saying, 'Me-daw-yo-em' o-kawd' (My leg is shot off). Hand me two loaded guns. I will have the last shot. Maw-tchawn' we-wib' (Be quick and go).' These were the last words of Tecumseh." Our fathers believed that neither the Americans nor the Indians knew who fired the fatal shot.

My father, Leopold Pokagon, had been a Pottawattamie chief thirteen years before this battle, and so remained until his death, twenty-seven years after. Most of his band were sent West in 1837. He and some five hundred of his people, having embraced Christianity, were permitted to remain in Michigan. In 1866, they numbered three hundred and fifty: nearly all were of pure Indian blood. At the present time, they number two hundred and seventy-one: nearly one-half are of mixed blood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having briefly reviewed some of our past history, the fact must be admitted that, when the white men first visited our shores, we were kind and confiding; standing before them like a block of marble before the sculptor, ready to be shaped into noble manhood. Instead of this, we were oftener hacked to pieces and destroyed. We further find in our brief review that the contending Powers of the Old World, striving for the mastery in the New, took advantage of our trustful, confiding natures, placing savage weapons of warfare in our hands to aid us in butchering one another.

It is useless to deny the charge, that at times we have been goaded to vindictive and cruel acts. Some of my own tribe, however, were soldiers in the Northern army during the civil war. Some of them were taken, and held prisoners in the rebel prisons, and the cruelty which, according to the tales they tell, was witnessed there was never outdone in border warfare with the scalping-knife and tomahawk. And yet I believe that, had the Northern people been placed in the South under like circumstances, their prisoners of war would have been treated with similar cruelty. It was the result of a *desperate* effort to save an expiring cause. I believe there is no reasonable person, well grounded in United States history, who will not admit that there were ten times as many who perished miserably in Southern prisons as have been killed by our people since the discovery of America. I recall these facts not to censure, but to show that *cruelty and revenge are the offspring of war, not of race*, and that nature has placed no impassable gulf between us and civilization.

It is claimed that the United States have paid out five hundred million dollars in trying to subdue the red man by military force. But now—thank Heaven!—through the influence of good men and women who have thrown the search-light of the golden rule into the great heart of the nation, her policy is changed. Where hundreds of thousands of dollars were paid out annually to fight him, like sums are now being paid yearly to educate him in citizenship and self-support; that his children may not grow up a race of savages to be again fought and again cared for at the expense of the nation. I rejoice in the policy now being pursued. If not perfect, it is certainly on the right trail to success.

While a guest at Chicago, during the World's Fair, I spent much time at the United States Indian School. There I met many delegations from different governmental schools. I was particularly interested in the delegation from Albuquerque, New Mexico, composed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Navajos, Pinas-Mojaves, Pueblos, and others. With pride I examined the articles which they had made, their clean, well-kept writing-books, and listened to their sweet vocal and instrumental music. I then and there said, in my heart: "Thanks to the Great Spirit, I do believe the remnant of our race will yet live and learn to compete with the dominant race; proving themselves worthy of the highest offices in the gift of a free people."

The Indian school at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, has done wonders in showing what can be effected for the education of our children. The test there made is a reliable one, inasmuch as that school is made up of pupils from more than sixty different tribes, from all parts of the United States. I was highly gratified a few months ago to learn that the foot-ball team from that school was able to defeat the champion Wisconsin team at Chicago, receiving many compliments from the immense crowd for their tact and self-control as well as for their physical development, —showing conclusively that our race is not, as some claim, becoming enfeebled and running out.

While I most heartily indorse the present policy of the Government in dealing with our people, I must admit—to be true to my own convictions—that I am worried over the ration system, under which so many of our people are being fed on the reservations. I greatly fear it may eventually vagabondize many of them beyond redemption. It permits the gathering of lazy, immoral white men of the worst stamp, who spend their time in idleness and in corrupting Indian morality. I do hope the Government will provide something for them to do for their own good, although it should pay her little or nothing. Again: I fear for the outcome of the Indian nations. Our people in their native state were not avaricious. They were on a common level; and, like the osprey that divides her last fish with her young, so they acted toward each other. But I find, to my sorrow, that, when you associate them with squaw men, and place them in power, they develop the wolfish greed of civilization, disregarding the rights of their less fortunate brothers. I must admit that it staggers my native brain to understand what reason, equity, or justice there is in allowing independent powers to exist within the bounds of this Republic. If the "Monroe doctrine," which has been so much petted of late years, should be enforced anywhere, it would certainly be in the line of good statesmanship to carry it out, at least in principle, at home.

Lastly, Pokagon must admit that he feels very deeply the ravages made among his people by the "intoxicating cup." Were it an open

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enemy outside our lines, we might meet it with success. But alas! it is a traitor within our camp, cunning as Wa-goosh (the fox). It embraces and kisses but to poison like the snake—without the warning rattle. Before I associated with white men, I had supposed that they were not such slaves to that soulless tyrant as the red man. But I have learned that the cruel curse enslaves alike the white man in his palace and the red man in his hut; alike the chieftain and the king; the savage and the sage. I am indeed puzzled to understand how it is that the white race, whose works seem almost divine, should not be able to destroy this great devil-fish, which their own hands have fashioned and launched upon the sea of human life; whose tentacles reach out into the halls of legislature and courts of law, into colleges and churches,—doing everywhere its wicked work.

As to the future of our race, it seems to me almost certain that in time it will lose its identity by amalgamation with the dominant race. No matter how distasteful it may seem to us, we are compelled to consider it as a probable result. Sensitive white people can console themselves, however, with the fact, that there are to-day in the United States thousands of men and women of high social standing whose forefathers on one side were full-blooded so-called savages; and yet the society in which they move, and in many cases they themselves, are ignorant of the fact. All white people are not ashamed of Indian blood; in fact, a few are proud of it.

At the World's Fair on Chicago Day, after ringing the new Liberty Bell, and speaking in behalf of my people, I presented Mayor Harrison, according to the programme of the day, with a duplicate of the treaty by which my father, a Pottawattamie chief, in 1833, conveyed Chicago—embracing the fair-grounds and surrounding country—to the United States for about three cents per acre. In accepting the treaty, the venerable Mayor said: "Grateful to the spirit of the past, I am happy to receive this gift from the hand of one who is able to bestow it. Chicago is proving that it recognizes the benefits conferred through this treaty. I receive this from an Indian all the more gratefully because in my own veins courses the blood of an Indian. Before the days of Pokagon, I had my origin in the blood that ran through Pocahontas. I stand to-day as a living witness that the Indian is worth something in this world."[1]

[1] Certain it is that the families of Harrison, Rolings, Rogers, and many others tinctured with the Indian blood of Pocahontas are superior in health to, and fully as strong intellectually and morally as, those families from the same branch of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have made diligent inquiries of the headmen of different tribes as to what estimate they place on the half-breeds among them. Their general reply has been, "They are certainly an improvement on the pale face, but not on the red man." Which no doubt is the case; for it is a lamentable fact that criminals, outlaws, and vagabonds are generally the first who seek homes among us, bringing with them nearly all the vices and diseases, and but few of the virtues, of civilization. Yet, notwithstanding such an unfortunate mixture, we find some grand characters who have been able to rise high above the sins of parentage. I have further found, by close observation, that those tinctured with our blood are far less subject to nervous diseases; but whether at the expense of intellectual force or otherwise, I am not so certain. Be that as it may, we cannot safely ignore the fact, that it is the physical development of the people of a nation that gives it strength and stability; that physical decay brings loss of executive ability, and has proved the overthrow of ancient kingdoms. I do not wish it to be understood that I advocate or desire the amalgamation of our people with the white race. But I speak of it as an event that is almost certain; and we had much better rock with the boat that oars us on than fight against the inevitable. I am frequently asked, "Pokagon, do you believe that the white man and the red man were originally of one blood?" My reply has been: "I do not know. But from the present outlook, they surely will be."

The index-finger of the past and present is pointing to the future, showing most conclusively that by the middle of the next century all Indian reservations and tribal relations will have passed away. Then our people will begin to scatter; and the result will be a general mixing up of the races. Through intermarriage the blood of our people, like the waters that flow into the great ocean, will be forever lost in the dominant race; and generations yet unborn will read in history of the red men of the forest, and inquire, "Where are they?"

SIMON POKAGON.

pure white blood. John Randolph of Roanoke, a near descendant of this Indian woman, and strongly marked with our race lines, was several times Congressman from Virginia, once United States Senator, and minister to Russia. In his time his speeches were more read than any others. His masterly arguments were the pride of his party and the terror of his opponents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATESMANSHIP IN ENGLAND AND IN THE UNITED STATES.

A YOUNGSTER who sat next to Coleridge at dinner said: "What do you think of Dr. Channing, Mr. Coleridge?" "Before I enter upon that question," said Coleridge, settling himself into his seat as if for the night, "I must put you in possession of my views *in extenso* on the religion, progress, present condition, future likelihood, and absolute essence of the Unitarian controversy, and establish the conclusions I have, on the whole, come to upon the great question of what may be termed the philosophy of religious difference."

I am to say something about the conditions of statesmanship in England and in the United States. Before entering upon that question I ought, I suppose, if there were time and space, to state my views of the English Constitution, of the American Constitutions,—State and national,—of the relations of the national and federal elements to each other in our form of government, of town-meetings, of the effect that nearly three hundred years on this continent have had on the Englishmen who have come over here, of the effect on our national character of the large admixture of Celtic, Scandinavian, and other races, of the influence of slaveholding in our Southern States, of the distinction between written and unwritten constitutions, of the law of primogeniture, of commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural employment, of the isolation caused by the oceans which separate us from Europe and Asia, of England's neighborhood to other great Powers, of the effect on national character of governing other nations and races, as compared with having a good deal more to do than a people can well do in an attempt to govern itself, together with many other equally important matters too numerous to mention. But the years of a man's life are threescore and ten. And if I were to try to deal adequately with this subject, and by reason of strength should have fourscore years, the years of any person who should read this essay through would be labor and sorrow.

It is possible here to touch upon a few points only. One great change has taken place and is going on both in England and in this country. It comes from the growth of empire. It began in England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than seventy years ago. It has come upon us by reason of our rapid growth in population and in wealth since the War, and by reason of the large number of matters which the more liberal construction of constitutional powers prevailing since slavery was overthrown has required us to deal with. It is nearly impossible now for a statesman who is in power in either country to be the leader of its advanced thought. His whole time and strength must be taken up in dealing with the routine duties of his office. This is true of the President; it is true of the heads of departments; it is true of the leaders of the dominant party in both Houses of Congress; certainly of the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate and of the Ways and Means of the House; of the Committees on Appropriations in either branch; of the members of the great Law Committees. The American statesman of to-day, who is to provide supplies to carry on the routine of our vast Administration, and so regulate economies that the supply may be equal to the demand; to determine the burden and the benefit in every detail of a tariff or a tax as it affects thousands of industries; to understand every part of the complicated mechanism of our government; and who goes to bed every night wearied and worn out with labors and anxieties to which the manager of the largest and most complicated private concern is a stranger, has little room in his life for new schemes, new principles, or new thoughts. The country owes more than it knows to the men of both parties who have, of late years, so conscientiously and faithfully performed the great labor of keeping the machinery of government in operation. But they have performed this honorable service at great cost to themselves. They have been compelled to forsake the paths of a lofty statesmanship, even when they were most fitted for them.

Were Webster, or Clay, or Calhoun alive to-day, his career as a Senator must be, from necessity, of a different character from what it was. His leadership and guidance of the public thought would be exercised by writing or speech elsewhere than in the Senate Chamber. If Benton were living now he would be known only as an insufferable bore. The public business cannot bear the interruption of the great debates of former days. The public is impatient even of discussions which are absolutely necessary. Let some of our modern critics read Benton's story, in his "Thirty Years in the Senate," of the methods by which the desires of the majority were baffled, after the great Whig victory of 1840, and by which a minority overcame the imperious leadership of Henry Clay, and they will cease to contrast unfavor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ably the legislative methods of to-day with those of our predecessors.

There is one fundamental difference between the conditions in England and in this country. England is still governed by a class of gentry. In one sense the English government is a free and a popular government. But her great political parties are two aristocracies, responsible to the people, and competing for the confidence of the people; yet all the time one or the other keeps the government in its own hands. The English governing classes may be likened to the members of the trained professions,—law, medicine, divinity. Every family is free to choose its own; but the choice is made from the men who are trained to the business. Occasionally there is an interloper in the pulpit, or in the doctor's office, and sometimes, though very rarely, at the bar; but, in the main, you take your professional man from the trained class.

So it has a subduing and restraining effect on political strifes in England, that they are between members of an aristocracy still holding its place against the masses of the people. The two parties are constantly looking out for their common interests. They never fight to break a bone. Her Majesty's Government has a great respect after all for Her Majesty's Opposition; and neither faction of the gods in England will ever repeat Jupiter's experiment of calling in the giants to put down its antagonists.

We are the only people with any considerable experience of a government of the country by large masses of men. France has been a republic since 1871 only. Most of her political struggles since that date have been struggles to maintain a dynasty. Her political issues have been few in number. England's great suffrage extension was in 1884 and 1885; and still her party contests have been in the main the strifes of aristocratic leaders for power, and not between doctrines or measures determined by the opinion of great numbers of voters.

The English are a deferential people. The Englishman boasts himself of his political equality. But, in the main, John Bull loves a lord, and likes to be governed by a gentleman. This power of the governing class is preserved by the English policy of giving no pay to the Members of the House of Commons; so that nobody but a man of wealth can afford to hold a seat. It is also preserved by England's policy of giving great pay to the holders of her chief executive offices, which as a rule can be reached only through distinction in Parliament. So, while it is rare in England that a poor man can enter the high places of public service, no man who has reached them needs to abandon them from the necessity of getting his living.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The power of the governing classes there is, of course, still preserved by the law of primogeniture. Mr. Webster, in his Plymouth oration, pointed out that the equal division of real property among all the children was the true basis of a popular government; that without it republican government could not exist; and that where that system prevailed a republican government must very soon be established.

I am not able to judge whether the charge of some late English writers be true, that their landed aristocracy is changing into a plutocracy. I think, however, these statements have been much exaggerated. A like charge is frequently made as to this country; but I believe it, also, to be much exaggerated, and that the influence of wealth is, on the whole, diminishing here.

It will be hard to maintain that there is any great difference between Englishmen and Americans by reason of race. The first settlers of this country were Englishmen. Notwithstanding the great admixture of other races,—an admixture chiefly of those Northern races of which England herself was composed,—we are, in all essentials of national character, Englishmen still. Their emigrants who come here lose their distinctive character in a generation; or, if they come in childhood, their nationality cannot be detected after they grow up. It would be difficult for either country to establish the claim to an intellectual superiority over the other. The difference between us is the difference in institutions and local conditions.

The working of the American Constitution is distinguished from that of Great Britain by three influences,—periodicity, locality, and confederacy.

We choose our Chief Magistrate every four years, and the Members of one House of Congress every two years. One-third of the Senators go out of office every two years. The term of office of an individual Senator is six years. The Senate is controlled by a majority of the States. A majority of the people cannot change the policy of the country unless a majority of the States also consent. A Senator must be a citizen of the State from which he is chosen. Thus no change in the popular opinion can compel a change of policy during the four years of the President's term, nor can it compel a change of policy in a body where great and small States meet as equals, unless a majority of the States agree to the change. But the purpose and desire of the numerical majority of the American people may be baffled for twenty years by the local interests and feeling of a majority of the States, and those, perhaps, the smallest in population. This is a conservative principle more power-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful than monarch or House of Lords. It is a slow and deliberate process,—it takes a great while,—for this mighty being to change its mind.

This country is a compound of nation and confederacy. But in practice the influence of locality is much greater than even obedience to the Constitution demands. I am inclined to think that the operation of this single principle has more to do in distinguishing the public life of America from that of Great Britain than all our written Constitutions, State or national, would have without it.

In spite of the increase of the national authority since the War, many of our conditions are still those which belong to a confederacy. A man does not easily pass from one State to another. There is one instance where the same man—James Shields—represented, at different times, three States in the Senate of the United States; and there is another in our early history—Rufus King, who was Senator from Massachusetts and afterward from New York. But it is most unlikely that these instances will be repeated.

Even before the adoption of the Constitution, many of our States were essentially aggregations of separate towns or municipalities. Very early it was enacted in Massachusetts that the Representative must be an inhabitant of the town from which he was chosen. The consequence of this example has been most far-reaching. Throughout our Constitution, and in all our political habits we deal with separate localities on the principle of an entire equality. The Senators and Representatives in Congress must be citizens of the States they represent. With very few exceptions indeed, Representatives in Congress are taken from the districts where they dwell. The same thing is true of State legislatures. In the choice of Judges of the higher and lower courts, national and State, they are expected to represent fairly the different States and localities. The same thing is true in the formation of the Cabinet, and the selection of nearly one hundred and fifty thousand executive officers.

This necessity for considering locality in the selection of persons for high national offices embarrasses the American people at every step. No man, with rare exception, can have any considerable opportunity for public service, although he may be in accord with an overwhelming majority of his countrymen, unless he also happen to be in accord with the locality in which he dwells. When Mr. Webster was Secretary of State, Mr. Choate was the undisputed head of the American bar, unless Mr. Webster himself were to be excepted. It might easily have happened that, at the same time, the man of all others in the coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try fitted for Secretary of the Treasury would also have dwelt in Boston; or the fittest persons for these three offices might have been found living together in New York City; yet it would never have done to make Choate Attorney-General, or Abbott Lawrence Secretary of the Treasury, while Webster was in the Department of State. I suppose it would scarcely cause a remark if the three most important men in the English Cabinet dwelt next door to each other in London, or had adjoining estates in the country. In England an able public man can be elected to the House of Commons from any part of the three kingdoms. If he be valuable to his party, he is entirely independent of the influence of any one constituency. He can be kept in service for his whole life if his party need him. This renders an able man who is valuable to his party entirely independent of the influence of the local constituency. Thus every able Englishman is sure of continued public service. The careers of Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and Charles Sumner would have been impossible, had they happened to dwell in cities or districts opposed to them in opinion. New York is the greatest city in the United States. William M. Evarts was for many years the foremost living advocate. Yet his national service, so far as it was dependent on a seat in either House of Congress, lasted but six years. Take the list of the great lawyers of the United States to-day. See how many of them, who, if they were Englishmen, would be assured of a permanent place in public life, are almost wholly debarred from an opportunity of political usefulness by the accident of residence.

This gives a power to local prejudices in this country from which England is almost wholly free. Except the Irish question,—where a difference of race and of religion, centuries of oppression, and, till lately, a difference of language, have combined with insular position to nourish and keep alive local hatreds,—there is nothing like sectional strife in the empire of Great Britain. On the other hand, our demagogues still appeal to the sectional hatred of South against North, or of West against East. One would think there must be a clause in the Constitutions of some Western and Southern States to the effect that no man should be eligible to office until he had made in public at least one bitter attack on the East, and that no man should be continued in office except on the condition of repeating it at least twice a year. This is specially true of some communities which, less than a generation ago, were waste places, and where nearly all their dwellers are natives of the section they revile. The settler from the East sometimes hastens eagerly to acquire the necessary qualification.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This condition of things tempts able men, who have a natural and honorable ambition for political office, constantly to watch and yield to the varying moods of special constituencies. In this way men become great political followers, but not great political leaders. This diminishes the permanent power of political parties; but it tends to deprive men of the civic courage which makes them the guides and lights of their age, and likewise deprives such leaders of the power to accomplish their purposes. It would be ungrateful to say what has just been said, without excepting the noble and generous people of Massachusetts from the comprehensiveness of this statement. It has been the beauty and comfort of her public service that she has permitted those whom she has called to it the largest freedom in acting according to their own conscience and their own judgment. She will overlook almost anything in a public man except the violation of his own conscience for the sake of pleasing her.

There is not a man in this country to-day who is secure of an opportunity for official service extending more than six years ahead, except a judge. There are probably not ten men out of the Senate of the United States who have a reasonable expectation of a term even as long.

In England, also, the country can be appealed to at any moment, a new House of Commons chosen, and a new executive brought into power if the old one cease to represent the country on an important measure. In fact, this happens in England on an average about once in four years,—a period corresponding with the interval between our Presidential elections. But it might happen every six months.

This enables England to take up and settle public questions one at a time. First, there is a struggle in the House of Commons. Then there is an appeal to the people. It is rare in England that a question is reopened after it has once been decided by the constituencies. A defeat in the House of Commons overthrows an administration, or the people must be appealed to for a new vote of confidence. The vote of the nation in one election almost always settles the question.

On the other hand, a defeat in either House of Congress, or in both Houses of Congress, even on very important measures, does not overthrow an administration; and the defeat of a party in a national election does not settle a great question. Indeed, we are always disputing what was the significance of a particular vote, and which one of a dozen or twenty matters that were debated on the hustings controlled the popular verdict.

Our constitutional arrangements and the great size of our territory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make impracticable here an appeal to the people on single measures, which the ease of a general election makes simple in England.

Every Congress comes to an end, leaving many important measures undisposed of. The effect of this is, that there is a struggle between the leaders of the same party for the opportunity to bring their questions before the body to which they belong. There is no responsible leadership in the Senate, and no responsible leadership in the House, but that of the Speaker, who in theory is absolutely impartial, and in practice almost absolutely despotic. The result is that there is a struggle between the different leading committees for a chance to bring up their measures. Toward the close of the session this contest is specially apparent. A Member who has carefully prepared some important measure with which he is identified in public estimation feels that the success or failure of his political career depends upon his getting an opportunity to bring it to a vote. Statesmen of the same party are often engaged in angry altercations with each other, and in the House are apt to express bitterly their discontent with the Speaker. Many Administration measures fail in every Congress, the defeat of any one of which would have wrecked an English administration.

I think party discipline is much less powerful in the United States than in England. This comes largely from our division of powers into executive, legislative, and judicial. Our committee arrangements, also, in both Houses of Congress, interfere sadly with responsible leadership. And, as I have said, the constant sense of responsibility to local constituencies makes it hard for public men to consult either the highest national good or even the prevailing national desire and opinion. How many measures carefully framed by men to whom the responsibility for them has been assigned are upset by members of the same party with the men who frame them and are responsible for them! How difficult we find it to make a tariff! The Committee of Ways and Means report it: it is all torn to pieces in the House, unless, as in the most recent instance, the House is not trusted to hear it read, and it is passed blindfold under a suspension of the rules. When it comes to the other branch, the patched-up measure is mutilated by the committee of the Senate, and torn to pieces again by the Senate itself.

As I have said, there is not a man in the country to-day who is secure of an opportunity for official service lasting more than six years ahead, excepting a judge. There are probably not ten men out of the Senate of the United States who have a reasonable expectation of a term even so long. Now this insecurity and brevity in the term of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public service make the American statesman impatient and in a hurry to accomplish his public purposes. If he be ambitious, he must hasten to make his mark. If he have at heart some great measure for the public good, he must accomplish it while he has the power. He must make hay while the sun shines. He must work while it is day; for the night cometh wherein no man can work. This hurry is in strange contrast with the quiet and deliberate security of the Englishman. It puts us at a great disadvantage in legislation and administration.

This disadvantage is especially manifest in our diplomacy. The American Secretary of State is eager to sign his name to a treaty, and the American Ambassador or Minister, to get the credit of some accomplishment for his country's advantage before the curtain shall fall on him. If he begin a negotiation and do not get through with it, if the negotiation be not a failure, he himself, at any rate, is a failure. How this delivers us into the hands of the quiet, secure, patient, steady Englishman, who knows that if the thing be not done this year, it will be done in some future year, and expects to be there himself to do it.

This want of security in public office, this hurry to make a mark, make the American statesman ambitious to effect some reform, or find and create some issue that does not arise naturally of itself. So political parties, or restless and energetic men who are elected to Congress or State Legislatures, are constantly seeking some new line in which they can take a lead before they are retired. Plenty of examples could be given. The scheme for biennial elections in Massachusetts always seemed to me to have no foundation in any real popular desire, but only in the desire to secure an issue. Now the Englishman who, if he be fit for it, is assured of his place in the country's service, is in no hurry. The American must act, or some other actor will take his place. The Englishman can wait. England can wait. England is in no hurry. She can watch always her opportunity to take advantage of the impatience of her antagonists. This great chess-player, since she became the first Power in Europe, after the fall of Napoleon in 1818, has made few false moves. Other countries scold at her, and revile her, and charge her with perfidy. But she bides her time. She keeps her eye steadfastly upon her object. In the main, I think the charge of duplicity against her is without foundation. If she get the advantage of her antagonists, it is their own fault and not hers.

Our State governments and municipal institutions have a great value in training men for national service, to which nothing in England corresponds. The law governing parliamentary procedure must be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unknown to many intelligent men who enter the House of Commons, and probably is never acquired by many persons who have a considerable service there. But our State legislatures and municipal governments make most intelligent American citizens familiar with it.

Both countries have a free press. In both countries the newspaper attacks with unrestrained severity the public and private character of public men with whom it differs in opinion; but the English statesman does not have turned upon his private life the search-light in whose glare the American statesman must spend his. This is, I suppose, partly because in the vast solitude of London, an espionage is impossible which is easy in Washington. I suppose, too, there is less austerity in English public opinion.

I think the conductors of English newspapers stand by their country better than ours. English people would not tolerate in their own press the stream of scurrility and falsehood which is constantly poured out on our country by some American journalists. The American people are reproached with having a bitter dislike of the mother-country. I do not think the reproach is well founded. But if it be, is it strange, when we see what descriptions of the public life in America find their way into great English journals, and seem to be acceptable to their readers, and what representatives of the American press are selected for public honors? The course of some great English newspapers toward the United States is a perpetual insult. We know that they do not represent what is best in English opinion, any more than they fitly describe what is best in American public life. But I think we are entitled to some credit from our English brethren that our international good-will has survived in spite of the London "Times" and the "Saturday Review."

The English people have an indifference to logical consistency and symmetry in their public policies. In this they differ from the French and from us. The Englishman hates a doctrinaire. So the English Constitution is a quilt of patchwork. They seem to like to have the next thing they do differ both in manner and in principle from the last. The arrangement for Irish representation in the House of Lords and in the Commons is totally unlike the arrangement for the Scotch. The curious arrangement of counties palatine, the different fashions of procedure in Lords and Commons, give the English ceremonial a quaint grotesqueness of which the American would be extremely impatient.

The Englishman is willing to let theoretical questions remain for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever unsettled, whereas the American would insist on having them out. The Yankee says "I want to know what my rights are." Let any claim be made of a right under the Constitution, and let it be disputed, and somebody will insist on having it settled. In one of the English colleges,—I think King's College at Cambridge,—there is an old claim that when the judges come to hold the assizes they are entitled to occupy during their stay the house of the Head of the College. This claim is disputed by the Head of the College. When the judges approach the town, the Head of the College goes out to meet them, and says that they would be happy to have Her Majesty's Judges make their stay in the house belonging to the College while the assizes last. To which the judges reply that "they are coming." When the threshold of the dwelling is reached, the Head of the College bows and prays the judge to enter and make himself at home; and the judge bows and requests the Head of the College to enter and make himself at home, each assuming the tone of a host to a guest. And so they go in together and occupy the house. And for more than four hundred years the question, whether the judge or the Head of the College has the right to the house at the assize season, has remained unsettled. Imagine such a question remaining open for six weeks anywhere in this country!

I do not think that the Englishman likes to be flattered. He likes better to grumble and to have people complain to him about somebody or something. He seldom brags. He considers the greatness of England an assured fact, to be taken for granted, like the force of gravitation or the importance of the sun to the solar system. I hope the time is coming when we shall feel our greatness among the nations so well assured that our public men will stop talking about it. But the people now expect a good deal of boasting from our orators. Even our chaplains in their prayers inform the Lord of the greatness of this country and of the magnificence and the glory of the American people.

Our restraint under a written Constitution, and under a Supreme Court which can declare any State or national legislation unconstitutional, is hardly greater practically than the restraint upon the Englishman of his regard for precedent. Omitting questions which arise by reason of the Constitutional distribution of power between the States and the nation, it is very unlikely that anything would be done in England by act of Parliament which is not permitted under our Constitutional restraints; and these are chiefly prohibitions of violations of common right.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The want of certainty of the statesman's hold upon power, of which I have spoken, and the lack of inherited wealth, deprive us of the advantage of a class of men trained for statesmanship from youth. The questions with which the public man in this country has to deal require long and exclusive study to master them. Such study is impossible if he have at the same time to get his own living. He must, therefore, be a man of inherited wealth, or must be taken from some other calling to which he has devoted himself long enough to have laid by a competency sufficient for his support, and suitable provision for his family. So we have rarely here men like those so numerous in England, who are trained to public affairs from their youth. Wordsworth's

> "Blessed statesman he, whose mind's unselfish will
> Leaves him at ease among grand thoughts,"

may perhaps still be found in considerable numbers in England; but in this country his high thinking must go with very plain living indeed, if he have to live on his salary. We have here what England lacks, —the training for larger service of the town meeting, the city council, and the exercise of State legislative and administrative offices. We have, too, the interest in public affairs which belongs to a republic, where every man feels a responsibility and expects to understand what is going on. The Yankee baby seems to draw in a knowledge of Parliamentary law with his infant breath, and, before he can walk, is ready to rise in his cradle and raise a point of order upon his nurse. So, able and well-educated men, although their lives may have been devoted to private affairs, come to the public service, even late in life, with an intelligent interest, an extent of information, and an aptness for their work which I think are lacking in the ordinary Englishman.

But, on the other hand, what an opportunity England has to educate the children of her favored classes in her colonial service! What an opportunity in her diplomatic service! What an opportunity in her vast navy, and her trained army, always ready for war! Ours is a government by the average citizen. England is a government by the aristocracy. While this may seem to give England some special advantage in immediate results, it yet remains to be seen whether it will give her an advantage in the end. Roger Sherman used to say that he looked for the strength of the Constitution of the United States in the end not chiefly to the Senate or the Judiciary, or to any Bill of Rights, but to the fact that the interest of the men who were to administer the government would always be the same with that of the people to be governed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England, doubtless, governs well. She obtained her great Indian empire by unjustifiable means; but she rules it better and better from generation to generation. There are no better examples of a great governing race than the men she has sent out to India during the last fifty years,—the Lawrences, the Stephens, and their companions. "The sahibs don't like us;" said an Indian philosopher, "but they are absolutely just, and they do not fear the face of man." While England has trained this race of gentlemen to govern well her three hundred and fifty millions of subjects, the United States have not governed Alaska nor their two hundred and fifty thousand Indian dependants even decently.

Whatever changes for the better or worse have happened in either country, it is still true that while the English statesman is devoted to the glory and greatness of England, and while he desires to extend her empire, and while he desires to maintain her honor unstained, the great object and purpose of all his statesmanship is that he shall be able to hand down his broad acres, his ancestral dwelling, and his stately trees from eldest son to eldest son for generations to come, though a thousand paupers starve in their hovels, and though every fifth person in the kingdom must, some time in his life, receive aid from the state. On the other hand, the great object of American statesmanship has been, is, and is to be, to keep up wages, and to educate a whole people who shall dwell in happy and comfortable homes and not in huts or hovels.

The people of both countries are enlightened, honest, patriotic, and free. They are able to command, and in the main do command, in each generation, the kind of public service which the needs of the generation require. If the lofty and stimulant leadership of the elder Pitt, if the parliamentary skill and resolute courage of the younger Pitt, if the independence and economic wisdom of Cobden and Bright, or the military genius of Wellington, be not found in the counsels of England to-day, it is because England does not need them to-day. When she needs them, they will be forthcoming. If the constructive statesmanship of the framers of the Constitution, the comprehensive wisdom of Madison, the profound insight and dominant intelligence of Hamilton, the majestic eloquence of Webster, the chivalrous leadership of Clay, the uncompromising devotion to humanity of Sumner, the patient circumspection of Lincoln, are not now to be found in the counsels of our Republic, it is because the present day demands another kind of service for the Republic. When these things are needed, they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will appear. The men of letters, the political philosophers, from the time of the satires of Churchill, from the time when Wordsworth proclaimed England to be "a fen of stagnant waters," and demanded the recall of Wellington from the head of the English armies and his disgrace in the eyes of Europe, have denounced the public life of their time, as their successors do to-day. What is wanted in this country now is the honest, faithful, industrious, and intelligent management of its business affairs, both in State and nation. And this the generation abundantly supplies.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF HAWAII.

On May 16 of this year the President transmitted to the Senate a proposed treaty with the so-called Republic of Hawaii, by which it is designed to merge that nation into the United States. The Executive and the Secretary of State at the same time enumerated the grounds which they deemed sufficient to warrant annexation. I shall endeavor to show that none of the arguments made in advocacy of the outlined programme is sound, that Hawaiian annexation is detrimental to the interests of the United States, and that if such a policy might at any time be desirable, its accomplishment now and under circumstances at present prevailing must be alike impolitic and dishonorable.

The President apparently relies upon the declaration that annexation is "the necessary and fitting sequel to the chain of events which, from a very early period of our history, has controlled the intercourse and prescribed the association of the United States and the Hawaiian Islands." Unfortunately for this contention, the recitals made by the Executive show merely friendly and commercial intercourse and the adoption of a uniform policy favoring Hawaiian autonomy. True, the popular suggestion which refers to the dominancy of American interests in "that neighboring territory" is noted by the President. It is now, however, actively urged that the presence in the Islands of a few Americans necessarily requires our intervention and permanent occupancy.

The Secretary of State bases his recommendation upon the authority granted by the Hawaiian Constitution of 1894. He opposes commercial union because of the dangers of the "vicissitudes of public sentiment in the two countries." He evidently wishes to strike the iron while it is hot, and seeks to make a perpetual compact because of the uncertainty of popular desire. He does not care to risk a reversal of present policies. "Let us grab it while we may," epitomizes this statesmanship. The Secretary assumes that there must be annexation or a commercial union or a protectorate. He forgets the propriety of following precedents by attending to our domestic concerns. He does not recollect that our official notice of non-interference by other Powers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has always proved effective. Possibly the Administration hopes to hasten, by mid-Pacific conquest, the advent of that prosperity so confidently and vainly promised. While the President may not have felt bound fully to sustain his theories, nevertheless suggestions intended to excite sympathy have been made elsewhere from day to day. We have been told that our Pacific Coast will not be safe until we are masters of the Hawaiian Islands. It is "proper form" to allude to these South-Sea folk as "our kinsmen," to call attention to their "proximity," and to refer, as does President McKinley, to "that neighboring territory." "Neighboring," as thus used, is defined to mean "situated near by, being in the vicinity, adjacent." It is important to remember that the soil we propose to absorb—this "neighboring territory"—is more than two thousand miles from the nearest point of the present United States. Our "neighbors" are not near enough to disturb our rest. There is no garden-wall interchange of views.

But we are dogmatically told that we must have the Islands for purposes of protection; that our country cannot be safe without them. I deny the accuracy of this contention. We can make a better contest without than with Hawaii. If we accomplish annexation for defensive objects we should fortify our new domain. We must build a navy capable of sustaining it. I am unable to give figures as to the cost of proper fortifications. That the expenditure must be immense, no one will dispute. In the event of war there could be no help within call to aid the distressed islanders. A week would be consumed in transporting our navy—if we possess a navy. Our coasts are not now fortified, notwithstanding years of effort. Even New York and San Francisco are insufficiently guarded. As for our navy, Admiral Walker, before the Senate Committee on Coast Defences, described the situation, when he said, that if the English should engage us they would probably capture or destroy our navy, and that, by putting all our vessels behind Sandy Hook, we could make something of a fight for that place, but that nothing would prevent the foe from raiding the whole coast. While we are very slowly increasing our naval strength, our leading European competitors are acting with more alacrity. Our disparity as regards at least England and France is hourly becoming more and more evident.

If we must go into the foreign acquisition business we should, for quite a period, spend not less than one hundred million dollars per year for naval purposes, and almost an equal sum for coast defences. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not prepared to commit ourselves to such idiocy. There are some who think that we can prepare for war within twenty-four hours. Much time must be consumed in building even one war vessel; and a 12-inch gun cannot be easily turned out in less than eighteen months. It will take General Flagler three years from the beginning of his work to complete the 16-inch cannon which is being manufactured, and which will, I trust, prove to be the most powerful engine of destruction ever devised.

If, unhappily, we shall engage in foreign contention, where will the enemy strike? Manifestly where he can inflict the severest injury. He will not assail the Muir Glacier, nor will he direct his armies or navies against the leper settlement of Molokai. Boston, New York, San Francisco, and other seaports will be decidedly interested in the event of a conflict with a great naval Power. If San Francisco were attacked after annexation, would our batteries at Honolulu be effective? Would our battle-ships stationed there aid us? But it is urged that England, in case of trouble, may seize Honolulu, and that the Japanese may do so. England clearly will not operate against us from Honolulu. She has a veritable Gibraltar at Esquimault on the Washington boundary. Why should she divert and divide her strength by permitting her guns and ships to rust two thousand miles from her enemy, especially when she is splendidly equipped at a point within sight of the smoke of our civilization? For more than forty years England has denied any hostility to Hawaii.

"How about Japan?" I am asked. Japan surely does not intend to attack us. She, as well as Great Britain, explicitly disclaims any such purpose. I have no fear of difficulty there. Considerations too numerous to mention make such an occurrence highly improbable. But if it shall be otherwise and Japan shall take Hawaii, she will not thereby be enabled to assail the United States. To reach Honolulu from Japan requires a voyage of over thirty-six hundred miles, and the Islands are not on the American-Oriental sailing route. The capture of Hawaii would be a foolish enterprise for any antagonist of the United States. It is palpable that we could not hold the Hawaiian Islands, if the enemy found it desirable to possess them (an unlikely hypothesis), without vast outlay and without weakening our home defences. If we constructed impregnable forts there and mounted thereon hundreds of modern cannon, we should be left alone in our grandeur without any enemy to defeat, or anything particularly valuable to protect. Our Honolulu armies would be as lonely as was Robinson Crusoe. If we are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to defend ourselves, we must do so at home. Why should we seek the South Pacific in order to secure our coasts?

I have heard that the possession of the Hawaiian Islands means the control of the North Pacific. I admit that the nation possessing this group may dominate the North Pacific; but such dominancy will not in any manner depend upon the occupancy of these spots in the ocean. The subjection of the North Pacific depends upon the naval prowess of contending nations. The most valiant army stationed in Hawaii, and possessing the best equipment and unlimited supplies, cannot rule the North Pacific without an unrivalled naval force. Take the case of England, now the leading sea Power. Does that Empire need the Hawaiian Islands, located near the twentieth degree of north latitude, when she is the possessor of a magnificent fortification at Esquimault, situated close to the fiftieth degree of north latitude? That defence is far more effective as a controlling element, so far as the North Pacific is concerned, than would be any construction at Honolulu. The enthusiastic advocates of annexation forget that the North Pacific must yield to ships of war, and that a nation possessed of all the islands in the South Pacific would not, because of such possession, command the seas there or elsewhere.

It is averred that we shall need the Islands when we construct the Nicaragua Canal. We are advised that we cannot otherwise properly defend that work. The suggestions already made dispose of this pretence. If we make and own the Canal we must fortify its approaches. The western terminus would not be better protected by guns mounted at Hawaii than by those which guard the Golden Gate. Our battleships can be dispatched from California to Nicaragua more speedily than from Honolulu. Nor would the presence of an enemy at the latter point imperil the Canal. A foe can reach our shores without touching at Honolulu; and, as I have said, if we arrange matters so as to make it uncomfortable there for an enemy, he will take another course and thus steer clear of us. The important naval Powers have numerous possessions in and on the Pacific.

But it is urged that we must have a coaling-station, and that, therefore, annexation is desirable. Pearl Harbor is ours: if we desire to fortify it, to dredge it, to make it useful, we may do so; and a coaling-station will thus be provided without annexation. Such a station would be unnecessary in times of peace; and in the event of war coal should be procurable upon the usual lines of commerce. If we are to have a coaling-station in the mid-Pacific, why not fix it in the Aleutian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

group? No vessel engaged in Asiatic-American commerce plies anywhere near our South-Sea neighbors.

If those of our countrymen who are belligerently inclined really intend to stir up a fight with England, why not provide for the protection of an eligible Aleutian island, and from thence prey upon the enemy's commerce? Our trade is quite safe in any event. We are without ships; and, under prevailing legislation, we are likely, I regret to say, to continue deficient in that direction. I have no apprehension of difficulty with England, nor, indeed, with any nation. Our business relations with the formidable Powers are too close to permit war. The disasters which would be visited upon England in the event of a struggle with the United States are palpable. She could not inflict injury upon any of the property of the United States without involving herself in financial losses beyond estimation. Japan is busy developing her manufactures and her newly acquired domain. She is acting judiciously, and is likely to preserve her temper, notwithstanding the atrocious discriminations of the Dingley Bill. The effort to make our people believe that Japan proposes to seize Hawaii comes from the cute promoters of annexation.

It is said that annexation should be favored because Americans have paramount interests in Hawaii. This argument was made with reference to the Transvaal by the enterprising gentlemen who tried to run over the Krüger government. They have had an opportunity to reflect upon the impropriety of attempting to manage affairs without their jurisdiction. I am confident that the missionaries who settled in Hawaii did so disinterestedly. It is not likely that it was their purpose to sweep their converts from power and convert their property *lucri causa*. It would be unjust to attribute to them the commercial immorality which subsequently eventuated. No settler in any country is justified in subverting the government by whose favor he entered, merely because such subversion will add to his profit. Such is one of the excuses under which despots have confiscated and assassinated. It suggests the claims of arrogant wealth when trampling upon impoverished merit. It is the argument of might against right, of barbarism against civilization. Our brethren who went to the Hawaiian Islands embarked in ventures under a government which did not derive its authority from them nor exist by their consent. Matters have so changed that the native Hawaiian who put his property into the business which followed the coming of the progressive foreigner came out with the experience, and the energetic visitor got the wealth. The ex-Queen acted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a manner to excite the disapproval of American residents. She was thereupon captured; and, as the outcome of American valor, the Islands were subdued and the so-called Republic established. It endures in defiance of the will of the governed; and the very intelligent and positive American-Hawaiian citizens, numbering less than two thousand males, who established the prevailing oligarchy, have tendered to the United States a country which they hold by conquest, and whose inhabitants, native to the soil, and universally educated in the rudiments, are not to be consulted as to a compact which means the obliteration of nationality.

Several powerful nations of modern times, ruled upon the monarchic plan, have seized territory for commercial reasons and because of sympathy with resident subjects. But we cannot justify ourselves upon any such ground. No such departure from our traditions and theories can be for a moment legitimately tolerated. The rôle of the despot is unsuited to the American.

It is argued that our commerce with Hawaii is so important that we cannot afford to risk outside interference. That we have valuable trade there is plain. It is also clear that large profits have been made by parties who have taken advantage of the relations of the Islands to the United States. Mr. Spalding, who has been in Hawaii since 1867, and is a leading sugar-producer, remarked, before the Senate Committee, as follows:—

> "What we want is to make something out of the country; make expenses out of the country. It is not a commercial, agricultural, manufacturing, or mineral producing country; it has no resources, no available resources; never has had. All this prosperity has come from this reciprocity treaty with the United States."

The same gentleman also testified that he would not have remained in the Islands had it not been for reciprocity; that prior to that all plantation owners had failed.

Mr. Alexander has certified that rice can be profitably produced in Hawaii, and that the orange and banana flourish. I have the authority of an ardent annexationist that this statement is rather overdrawn; but Minister Stevens, in his letter of November 20, 1892, tells Secretary Foster that "sugar-raising on these islands *can be continued only by the cheapest possible labor—that of the Japanese, the Chinese, and Indian coolies*,"—a cheerful outlook for the American white laborer. Mr. Stevens writes to Secretary Foster that oranges, lemons, pineapples, and grapes can and will be successfully grown in the event of annexa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. How a change of government can add to the productive capacity of the soil, may be somewhat difficult to explain.

The above, I think, supports the conclusion that annexation is not necessary for the preservation of our trade. Common business sense dictates that a properly framed treaty—not the jug-handle affair now in force, which every disinterested person admits should be changed, but a really reciprocal engagement—will bring all desirable Hawaiian commerce to the United States. The Hawaiian Islands will deal with us because their interests make such a course necessary. Imperative considerations will continue this status. The man has not yet been heard from who can show that annexation will bring to the United States any advantage which will not be enjoyed as the result of our often declared policy, everywhere conceded, inhibiting foreign interference, and of the making of a sensible and equitable treaty. The citrus-fruit producers of the United States and those engaged in beet-sugar production have no cause to rejoice at the cheap-labor competition which must follow annexation. This, however, is a minor matter.

There are other vital objections to the validity of the proposed cession of the Hawaiian Islands to this government "of the people and by the people." Our policy is and always has been opposed to such investments. Washington spoke of the advantages of our "detached and distant situation," and said, "'T is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world." Mr. Jefferson, who favored the annexation of Cuba, said in a letter written to President Madison, April 27, 1809:—

"It will be objected to our receiving Cuba that no limit can then be drawn to our future acquisitions. Cuba can be defended by us without a navy; and *this develops the principle which ought to limit our views. Nothing should ever be accepted which would require a navy to defend it.*"

Secretary Frelinghuysen, in a note to Mr. Langston, dated June 20, 1883, says:—

"The policy of this Government, as declared on many occasions in the past, has tended toward *avoidance of possessions disconnected from the main continent.* Had the tendency of the United States been to extend territorial domain beyond seas opportunities have not been wanting to effect such a purpose, whether on the coast of Africa, in the West Indies, or *in the South Pacific.*"

He also wrote to the same minister:—

"A conviction that a fixed policy, dating back to the origin of our constitutional Government, was considered to make it inexpedient to attempt territorial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggrandizement which would require maintenance by a naval force in excess of any yet provided for our national uses, has led this Government to decline territorial acquisitions. *Even as simple coaling-stations, such territorial acquisitions would involve responsibility beyond their utility.* The United States has never deemed it needful to their national life to maintain impregnable fortresses along the world's highways of commerce."

Secretary Sherman, whose participancy in the present scheme has not failed to excite surprise, concludes his "Recollections" with the following remarks:—

"The events of the future are beyond the vision of mankind; but I hope that our people will be content with internal growth, and avoid the complications of foreign acquisitions. Our family of States is already large enough to create embarrassment in the Senate; and a republic should not hold dependent provinces or possessions. Every new acquisition will create embarrassments. Canada and Mexico as independent republics will be more valuable to the United States than if carved into additional States. The Union already embraces discordant elements enough without adding others. If my life is prolonged I will do all I can to add to the strength and prosperity of the United States, but nothing to extend its limits or to add new dangers by acquisition of foreign territory."

President McKinley, in his Inaugural Address, warned us against the temptation of territorial aggression.

Heretofore we have followed the rules thus laid down. Our extension of territory has been on the mainland, and, with the exception of Alaska, the added property has been contiguous. We entered into a tripartite agreement with England and Germany whereby we aid in maintaining a miserable counterfeit of regal greatness in authority at Samoa. This compact beween the leading republic of the world and two empires to force a barbarian ruler upon a protesting race was and is absurd enough. (Mr. Cleveland, to his credit, attempted to relieve us of this folly; but the legislative "spirit of conquest" rendered his efforts futile.)

If we annex Hawaii, the next move will involve Samoa,—distant four thousand miles. I am aware that Secretary Marcy encouraged the annexation idea; but his ambitious views did not convince the American people and were regarded as visionary. Nor did he have before him the domestic problems which at this hour challenge the supreme consideration of the ablest American patriot.

Is the character of the inhabitants of Hawaii such as to induce us to sigh for their society and personality? The following table shows the various nationalities represented on the Islands; the figures are from the last census:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nationality.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Hawaiians	16,399	14,620	31,019
Part Hawaiians	4,249	4,236	8,485
Americans	1,975	1,111	3,086
British	1,406	844	2,250
Germans	866	566	1,432
French	56	45	101
Norwegian	216	162	378
Portuguese	8,202	6,989	15,191
Japanese	19,212	5,195	24,407
Chinese	19,167	2,449	21,616
South Sea Islanders	321	134	455
Other Nationalities	448	152	600
Total	72,517	36,503	109,020

President McKinley's Inaugural contains this suggestion :—

"A grave peril to the Republic would be a citizenship too ignorant to understand or too vicious to appreciate the great value and beneficence of our institutions and laws; and against all who come here to make war upon them our gates must be promptly and tightly closed."

There is ample evidence that the native Hawaiians are possessed of educational qualifications covering at least the primary branches; but these attainments are not demonstrative of their ability to discharge the duties of American citizenship, although they are sufficient to elevate them far above the degradation which they suffer at the hands of those who ignore their just demands. The mental discipline to which the native Hawaiian has been for many years subjected certainly entitles him to a hearing when his civil rights are threatened. It does not, however, follow by any means that this right of consideration means the possession of the mental and moral faculties essential to the properly equipped American citizen. While I believe the evidence tends to show the incompetency of the native Hawaiian to meet the requirements of our citizenship, it is nevertheless clear that he is not a savage or a slave; and the land of his birth should not be disposed of without his concurrence.

Captain Dutton, of the United States Ordnance Department, delivered a lecture under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution in 1884, wherein he said :—

"The economic condition of the Hawaiian is probably superior at the present time to that of any other tropical people in the world; and, on the whole, I think

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it quite safe to say that it is but very little surpassed, if at all, by that of the working-classes of America. He has even more to eat and better food, plenty of beef, pork, and fish, and could have an abundance of flour if he desired it, but he prefers his taro. He owns his property in fee, he makes laws and executes them, he reads and writes, he has but one wife; he tills the soil and tends flocks; sometimes he accumulates wealth, and sometimes he does not; he makes his will in due form, dies and receives a Christian burial; in no land in the world is property more secure."

Mr. Spalding informs us that a republic would not be a good form of government for the people of Hawaii. He told the Senate Committee that the natives "are like a good many in the United States—better governed than governing," and testified as follows:—

"I have already said that a republican form of government would not be suitable for that people. That is an independent form of government. You might, for instance, if the Hawaiian Islands were a part of the State of California, do very well. I think they would send two or three or four Representatives to the State Capitol who would be equally respectable with the Representatives sent from the present counties in California."

The general tenor of the testimony taken by the Senate Committee is, that, notwithstanding the ability of the natives to read and write, they could not maintain a republic. But I repeat, this state of affairs does not authorize the United States, nor any other Power, to ignore the desires of these islanders as to the form of their government. They were contented and prosperous before the oligarchy. The incompetency of the Japanese and Chinese population, consisting of about forty-six thousand souls, will not be controverted. We have stringent laws excluding Chinese from the United States, and after much trouble we succeeded in negotiating a treaty virtually ratifying the Geary law; and our policy of exclusion has been enforced with comparative success. Our people, especially those who toil, are opposed to the introduction of servile Asiatic labor. I am aware that the treaty under consideration provides that "No Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands." The result of this peculiar provision is problematical. The State Department repudiates the obligation of Hawaii to Japan. If this view is correct, may it not be that the Chinese residents of Hawaii after annexation, being within the United States, will enjoy rights now participated in by their brethren in the various States? At all events, the fact remains that Hawaiian annexation means an addition to the population of the United States of more than twenty-one thou-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sand Chinese and more than twenty-four thousand Japanese. It is true that Japan has lately advanced astonishingly; but her laborers (of the class employed in Hawaii) are distasteful to us. We do not care to compete with them.

Bitter hostility must arise from this incorporation of about one-quarter as many Chinamen as are now within the United States. Do we need such a racial contribution? Will this new contact improve us? Will the introduction of these incongruities add to our honor or to our strength? We are daily seeking to perfect our immigration laws and to raise the standard of citizenship. The annexation proposition involves a wholesale infusion of deleterious constituents and agencies. The United States contain many who are not thoroughly advised concerning the responsibilities of democracy. Have we not enough to command our attention here at home? We are busy. Fiscal problems, questions of a basic character, compel our attention. Are we prepared to instil into the scattered tribes of the ocean the philosophy of free government? Can we educate all men in the tenets of true republicanism? The highest type of manhood is requisite to the permanency of republics. Despotisms may for a time get along without general diffusion of knowledge; but a republic depends upon the ability, integrity, and liberty-loving disposition of the masses. A minority only of the human family is fitted for self-rule. Hawaiian annexation would not stimulate our intelligence, patriotism, or power. Nor is it any answer to these observations to affirm that the destruction of a non-assimilative race will relieve us from peril. Such an argument is the defence of the conqueror. This powerful republic should not stifle the protests of those who are "to the manor born." We stand in the presence of internal dangers grave enough to warn us of the impropriety of seeking new perils. Elements of discord exist in the United States. Conflicting interests come to the surface daily. The American people are divided at this moment as to leading financial problems. There is more than one experiment on trial. While I am confident of our ability to meet all exigencies, I do not believe it wise to seek new embarrassments.

There are many Americans who, while holding that annexation is desirable, are unwilling to coöperate in a movement which means the annihilation of a nation without that nation's consent. The proposed treaty mentions the Republic of Hawaii. This is a misnomer. A member of the Hawaiian *de facto* judiciary has lately been quoted as stating that the government of which he is a part is really an oligarchy. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the truth. Mr. Stevens, through whose promotion of the revolution the alleged Hawaiian Republic was established, delivered a lecture, reported in the "Boston Journal" of November 23, 1893, in which he declared that the annexation issue ought not to be decided by popular vote because the result would be antagonistic to American interests. In other words, the theory is that the natives, who understand the situation thoroughly, but who are not sufficiently aggressive to make good citizens of the United States, ought not to be permitted to vote, because the result of such an election would mean the overthrow of usurpation. Never did a despot more confidently express the nefarious ground upon which he relied. No more impudent claim has been made in connection with this subject than that which is submitted by those who avow that the higher civilization which they represent involves the right to seize and govern, to bargain and sell.

It must be understood that I do not discuss the question of technical authority. I concede, for the sake of argument, that the provisions of the Hawaiian Constitution authorize annexation, and that our title derived therefrom would be legally good. I likewise readily assent to the doctrine that, for purposes of diplomacy, a government *de facto* must be recognized as a government *de jure*. But when we are asked to join in the obliteration of a government, it is our duty to consider the propriety of the cession, and not only to look at the question of physical ability, but likewise to ascertain the preferences of those whose political status is so vitally involved. A republic springing from universal desire should not accept a deed of empire without reference to justice. I have observed statements to the effect that the fact that the present régime had been maintained for some years is conclusive of the power to negotiate the pending treaty. As I have said, this is in a sense true. The President and Secretary of State appear to rely upon this proposition. But when it appears that the authority of the would-be grantors is based alone upon the support received from armed men, and that those whom it is designed to bring within our jurisdiction do not wish to come, I am prepared to ignore the pretences of the *de facto* government, so far as the attempt to destroy nationality is concerned, although I do not hesitate to join in recognizing it for the purposes of governmental intercourse.

If the natives are at all capable of comprehending their situation, they should be consulted: if they are utterly incompetent we should not bring them in. I will not discuss the means employed to accomplish the overthrow of the ex-Queen, nor the participancy in that *coup* of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the forces of the United States. Suffice it to say that no one has claimed that the native Hawaiians, numbering about forty thousand souls, ever agreed to the governmental change or had anything to do with the adoption of the present constitution. As a condition precedent to a vote under the Hawaiian act providing for a constitutional convention, the elector was compelled to swear that he would bear full allegiance to the provisional government, and would oppose any attempt to reëstablish a monarchy. Upon complying with this requisite he became qualified to vote. The election was, therefore, confined to the narrow precincts within which those who conducted the provisional government moved. The natives who took no stock in that government were shut out; and the small but powerful oligarchy managed the election to suit the occasion. This programme has been followed ever since. A constitution is supposed to be the very basis of the government.

When a people elect delegates to a convention called for the purpose of framing an organic law, it is expected that the nature and form of government will be thoroughly discussed and solved; but the patriots who now propose to give Hawaii to the United States so prescribed the qualifications of the electors who chose delegates to the constitutional convention that all opposition was removed, and no one not in sympathy with the prevailing usurpation was allowed to be heard. The alleged Hawaiian Republic is a bogus republic. It does not exist pursuant to the will of the governed, but notwithstanding such will.

The people of the Hawaiian Islands are worthy of consideration. True they belong to an inferior race. They are not equal competitors in the world-wide field of modern aggressiveness. Had they possessed the nerve, the snap, the bravery of the Anglo-Saxon, this proposed treaty would never have been formulated. I have called attention to the circumstance that witnesses conversant with the Hawaiian character declare that while the natives would not make ideal Americans, yet they possess some educational advantages. Even before the revolution it was a very rare thing to find a native who could not read and write his mother-tongue. The editor of the Honolulu "Evening Bulletin" is authority for the statement that six out of seven native Hawaiians were on school registers last year. Rev. Oliver P. Emerson testified before the Senate Committee that he believed it would be difficult to find a single native Hawaiian over twelve years of age unable to read or write. Assuming that the natives are not adequate to the task of the highest American citizenship, is it just to deprive them of nationality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without their suggestion or coöperation and against their desires? They were offered the privileges of voters at the price of servility. If I advocated annexation, I would still require the submission of the question to the real citizens of the Islands, including the native race. I cannot appreciate the attitude of the patriotic American who believes in liberty, who is prepared to defend the rights of the people, but who insists upon approving the action of a few who, exercising authority in defiance of the majority, propose, without honest title, to alienate a nation.

I have said that we must, so far as diplomacy goes, recognize those actually governing; but this does not mean that we can always properly accept title from a *de facto* ruler. We should go to the root of the claim. The moral side of the matter must not be ignored. I do not concede the integrity of the title offered. I am confident that the people whose rights are affected are antagonistic to the project. It is against our policy and interest to interfere in the affairs of remote islanders. The proposed acquisition is not necessary for our protection, nor important to our trade. Judicious treaty arrangements will secure all possible mercantile advantages. There is no danger of foreign interference in the presence of our avowed insistence upon Hawaiian autonomy; our rights in that regard being universally admitted.

STEPHEN M. WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE PLAGUE IN BOMBAY.

In this article I shall endeavor to show that the bubonic plague was not an intractable disease; that its rapid spread was due largely to indifference on the part of the municipal authorities in Bombay; and, finally, that the institution of radical measures by Government sufficed at once to check the epidemic, and, within a reasonable period, to bring it to a close.

The bubonic plague appeared in Bombay toward the end of August, 1896. Incredible as it may seem, the disease raged for a month before any official notice was taken of it. As early as the first week of September the Municipal Health Officer was informed of the existence of the malady. According to his own statement, however, he had already known of it for some time. By September 3, certain physicians, who were members of the Municipal Corporation, were treating the disease as true bubonic plague.

The first cases appeared in Mandvie Ward, an abhorrently filthy district in the heart of the city, having 37,000 inhabitants, chiefly natives of the lower classes. The population in and about this ward is said to be the densest in the world. In some localities there are 760 people to the acre. Of the total population of the city, which is nearly a million, the greater part is crowded into an area of four square miles.

Despite the fact that, before September was half over, the native population had become thoroughly frightened, and an exodus from Mandvie had already begun, the Health Officer still officially ignored the whole matter. Not yet had the Municipal Commissioner taken a step to prevent the spread of the disease; nor had the press spoken. The presence of the plague was known to many; yet silence was the rule.

When three weeks of September were past, and between two and three hundred people had died of the pestilence, the subject was casually mentioned at an ordinary meeting of the Standing Committee of the Corporation (September 23). Not even then was the matter broached by the Health Officer. A private physician first called attention to it, and on the spot named the disease by its true name.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The malady," he said, "is the bubonic plague. . . . I think it is caused by the putrid emanation from the putrefying and decomposing matter in the sewers, which are choked and can only be called cesspools." Remarks were made by several other physicians, who corroborated what had been said and stated that the Health Officer had been informed of all the facts three weeks before.

The Health Officer still sat silent; but when he had been particularly requested to say something in regard to the plague he uttered this oracular remark: "In regard to the occurrences of cases of a peculiar type of fever referred to, it may be mentioned that the type is of a suspicious character."

The apathy of the Health Officer, however, was not shared by the whole Committee. One of the physicians at this very meeting went so far as to demand that plague-patients should be isolated. But this was going too far. The Committee contented themselves with saying that something ought to be done about the plague. The Health Officer refused to admit that the disease was plague at all. For a whole month longer he admitted no "deaths from plague" into the tables of vital statistics. At the end of that time he consented to register deaths from "bubonic fever"; but the word "plague" remained officially tabooed.

The reason for this concealment was tersely stated in the Municipal Corporation: Bombay was a trading city; and knowledge of the plague would hurt trade. For this, among other more personal reasons, the Commissioner and his subordinates concealed the truth. For this reason also the chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, a month after the pest appeared, declared that there was no such thing as plague in town; naïvely adding that, as Colombo had already quarantined against Bombay, anyone might see how inimical to the welfare of the city were revelations so untimely.

The Health Officer's only step to meet the "peculiar type of fever" was to remove the accumulated filth of years. For the city, to a great extent built on land made of refuse, had never been properly cleaned; and the streets, alleys, and sewers were all overloaded with the foulest matter. For twelve years complaints had been rife in regard to the danger of allowing sullage and night-soil to collect in the alley-ways and choke up the drains: for ten years the health of the city had been steadily declining.

The Municipality spent a good deal of valuable time in discussing the cause of the plague, and could come to no definite conclusion. On the whole they were inclined to the opinion that filth was innocuous,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that the plague was due to rats. Thus the Police Officer—who had a great deal more to say about sanitation than had the Health Officer—said at the next meeting (September 30) of the Standing Committee, that rats disseminated the plague, which was brought from Hong Kong or Bagdad in sugar, raw silk, or dates. The Health Officer was working hard and doing all he could to clean the city. What more could be expected of him? Why should people talk about the Health Officer's neglect of duty?

The Municipal Commissioner, who is the chief executive of the city, is empowered, under Section 434 of the Municipal Act, to "take such special measures as he shall deem necessary to prevent the outbreak of such disease [dangerous or infectious] or the spread thereof." A Government Committee, appointed the last day of September to inquire into the plague, recommended explicitly that the Commissioner should apply for more power; although the wording of the Act, even as it stands, might easily be interpreted to confer power enough to meet every sanitary emergency.

But the Commissioner, like the Health Officer, viewed the situation very calmly. On the very day that the Standing Committee were discussing whether filth had anything to do with the plague he gave it as his opinion that there was "no cause for very serious alarm." On receiving this advice Government, loath to interfere in municipal matters, retired, and left the control of the plague in the hands of the city authorities.

This report of the condition of affairs in Bombay, made by the executive to Government, was analogous to the sadly optimistic report of the Viceroy in regard to the famine. But Government was bound to abide by the official statement made to it. The result in both cases was disastrous. In regard to Bombay, Government contented itself with proposing, on October 5, that the sanitary staff of the Municipality should be increased. Meantime the Commissioner became frightened, for the plague had now been spreading for more than a month, and there was every indication that the Health Officer's method of meeting it was without avail. A week after he had telegraphed that there was cause for alarm he drew up a Notification (October 6), the terms of which were interpreted to mean that the segregation of plague-patients would be made compulsory.

This Notification of October 6 immediately became a bone of contention. It was six months to a day before the most recalcitrant natives were brought to see that English authority could enforce segregation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But this was under the pressure of a stronger hand than that of the Municipal Commissioner.

On September 30 the executive had applied for an extra grant of 100,000 rupees (about $33,000) for sanitary purposes. The grant was made at once; but about a third of it was spent in making manholes, and the remainder was sunk in the long-neglected work of cleaning the city and in purchasing antiquated disinfectants. Most of the appropriation was gone in three weeks (October 19). A thousand tons of silt had been dug up out of the drains. Though disinfected it still "emitted sickening smells"; and in many instances it stood for days heaped up in offensive mounds about the city. The heat was intense. Scarcely any rain had fallen in September; and in October the country was already suffering from famine-drought. The Health Officer's one thought was to remove silt and clean alley-ways. As to the segregation of plague-patients, he not only took no interest, but he expressed it as his deliberate opinion that it was "impracticable, out of the question." He had neither men nor means to enforce such a measure. The most done to prevent the spread of plague was to catch plague-patients as they ran around the city and disinfect them. But the arrest of such persons was always regarded as a happy accident. No system was employed; and thus from infected districts the fleeing natives shortly spread the plague over districts not before contaminated. The erection of a plague-hospital had been suggested; but the Commissioner did not think this necessary. There was but one hospital for infectious diseases of all kinds, and to this were sent such plague-patients as could be induced to go. But to most of the natives the idea of going to the hospital was abhorrent. They did all they could to escape detection, and preferred to die alone in the street rather than be cared for by aliens.

The publication of the Notification instantly arrayed Western sanitary science against Oriental prejudice. But the Health Officer's published statement, that segregation was "out of the question," played directly into the hands of the natives, who immediately protested against any form of enforced segregation, not only because in their opinion it was merely an English fad, but particularly on the ground that the sacred privacy of the Hindu or Mahomedan home was thereby invaded. The judgment of a committee of physicians (who had been especially appointed to report and advise), to the effect that segregation was a necessity, here went for naught. Few natives have yet learned that there is nothing holy which is opposed to the public weal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must not be supposed that this prejudice against the hospital and segregation was confined to the lower classes. Two-thirds of the Municipality are Indians, Hindus, Mahomedans, and Parsees,—the most intelligent native citizens of Bombay. There was scarcely one of them that did not oppose segregation.

Another religious phase of the opposition to segregation, or indeed to the application of any sanitary regulations, was the *Kismet* theory of the Mahomedans, which has its parallel in the faith of the Hindus. According to this theory, it is impious to try to escape from the fate prepared by God. Moreover, it is useless; and hence precautions are vain. The practical result of this theory is to make the natives disregard all laws of health. Disease and death are gifts of God. No importance is attached to the sanitary condition of houses or towns.

No sooner was the Notification of October 6 signed, and a few patients had been forcibly removed to the Arthur Road Hospital for Infectious Diseases, than the health of the town unfortunately began to improve. The Municipal Commissioner at once concluded that the plague was not going to amount to much after all; his fears vanished; segregation was enforced more and more negligently as the clamor of resistance rose and the plague declined. But the malady had quietly spread itself over a wide area. Before the middle of October plague was firmly fastened on Mandvie Ward, the Fort, Kolaba, and Kamatipur, —the most thickly settled quarters of the city. In almost every instance where it appeared in a new ward the outbreak could be traced directly to contagion from a patient who had escaped from an infected locality.

The population now began to be sensibly diminished, not so much on account of death as of flight. There was only a makeshift inspection at the railway stations. Thousands of the lower classes fled during the last weeks of September from fear of the plague, and many thousands more during October from fear of the hospital. Needless to say, they carried the plague with them into the Mofussil (country districts).

At the end of the second week of October the announcement was made that the plague had been brought under control. Perhaps it had. But on October 14 the English officers of the Municipality who, according to their own declarations, already had their hand upon the throat of the foe, released their hold and let the beast go free at the bidding of the native population.

There is probably not to be found in the annals of civilization so fatuous an utterance as the Memorandum of October 14 to the Health Officer, subsequently confirmed by the Act of October 30. On the for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mer date, because of protestations on the part of tenants in Mandvie Ward who objected to compulsory isolation, "it was decided by the Municipal Commissioner in consultation with the Health Officer," that the terms of the Notification ostensibly compelling segregation "should not be stringently put into force," as its provisions wounded the religious feelings of the community. In the first week of November formal instructions were issued to all the executive officers of the Municipality not to execute "stringently" the Notification of October 6.

That happened which might have been foreseen. The native officers, who had been forced to do a duty repugnant to themselves as well as to the patients whom they had coerced into obedience, interpreted these words to mean that they were to segregate nobody. There was, indeed, no case where, in the judgment of a family, proper segregation could not be effected at home. To send such patients to the hospital would be to enforce the law "stringently." Therefore only waifs went to the hospital. So ended the farce of segregation. Instantly the death-rate increased. The last week of October had shown the effect of segregation quietly discountenanced; but the mortality of the ensuing weeks showed the effect of its formal discontinuance. There was an ostentatious report of "marked improvement" recorded on October 24, before the order for segregation had been really rescinded. Thereafter, there was a steady increase in deaths from plague.

On the night of October 16 some miscreant had maltreated with tar the great statue of the Queen-Empress, which stands at the south end of the Esplanade. The effect of this act may be compared with that of the mutilation of the Hermes at Athens. Not only was there intense indignation on the part of the Anglo-Indians, but on the part of the natives of all classes there was a new terror added to life in Bombay. For the Queen-Empress is a divinity; her statue is a sort of idol; to desecrate it is to commit sacrilege. To add to the excitement, prophecies were circulated to the effect that the Sirkar (Imperial Government) would take signal vengeance on the people of Bombay by means of a general massacre of the inhabitants on the great feast of Divali, which occurs at the beginning of November. It was also believed that patients sent to the hospital were murdered to avenge the Queen; that disinfectants were poisons; that the blood of patients was drawn to weld together the foundations of new government buildings; and that every officer who inquired about plague-cases was a spy, who sought to compass the death of a new victim.

The people grew mad with terror. As Divali approached they fled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in ever-increasing numbers. In the city itself riots became frequent. Mobs attacked the hospital, angrily shouting that they would slay the doctors as the doctors would slay them.

After October 20, deaths from plague were admitted (under the caption of "fever") into the weekly mortality lists. From the beginning it was evident that the number of deaths was understated. Curiously enough the Health Officer himself on a previous occasion had formally stated that "the evidence of Municipal Officers" was not worthy of acceptance. His own evidence was now found to be of the same character. In many cases single physicians testified to knowing of more deaths from plague during one week in their own limited practice than were included for the same period in the record of the Health Officer, which should have been taken from the reports of all the physicians in the city. An official acknowledgment that the municipal reports were not trustworthy was made by the Commissioner and the Police Officer on December 30. It seems unnecessary to take other testimony.

According to the most careful computation, the plague mortality, which was about 174 for the week ending November 10, rose to 242 in the next week; to 314 the week after (November 24); and to 315 in the week ending December 1. The week following, the plague-deaths numbered 591, and the total mortality rose to 1,051, the greatest ever known in the city. In another month, *i. e.*, by December 29, the plague mortality was 1,484, and the total mortality 1,853 for the week.

The fear of death now began to prevail against religious prejudice. The more enlightened natives, as the death-rate advanced week by week, counselled a substitution for official segregation, and advised voluntary segregation, race by race, caste by caste, in hospitals erected by private subscription. But the advice came too late. Before some of these hospitals could be built the plague was nearly ended. Nor was it easy at any time to get the natives to enter their own private hospitals. Even voluntary segregation frightened them.

What was absolutely requisite was a house-to-house inspection of the city, and strict isolation of plague-patients. But what was done was to clean out drains and whitewash rooms where patients had died.

The Municipality appointed a few subordinates in the Health Department, and gave the hospital some new assistants. Most of the native physicians had run away from the city by December. The members of the Municipality also fled; notably the loquacious leaders of the people, who had been most influential in opposing sanitary regulations.

During the reign of terror which obtained in the city from Novem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber to January, Government had done nothing to show that it concerned itself with the state of affairs in Bombay. In Bombay itself the Anglo-Indians blamed the natives for not submitting to sanitary rules, the natives blamed the Anglo-Indians for suggesting segregation; and in the latter circle the Health Officer blamed the Commissioner for neglect of duty, while other Anglo-Indians blamed the Health Officer for similar dereliction. The Municipality was divided against itself. In all this conflict the means taken to stay the plague were inadequate; the officials were apathetic or doggedly content to toil on in a manner long shown to be unavailing. The prospect was that nothing effective would ever be done within the limits of the city.

That something must be done, seems to have struck the attention of Government very suddenly. As late as January 8, the Governor, Lord Sandhurst, expressed the opinion that the means hitherto adopted was all that was needful to secure a gradual cessation of the plague. This was the politely expressed view of Surgeon-General Cleghorn also, who was sent from Calcutta to give his opinion. But Dr. Cleghorn's formal advice was that the healthy people in an infected district should be "hutted," *i. e.*, sent to segregation camps. A report, embodying this suggestion was sent to the Municipality. The report created a shibboleth: "The healthy to the huts, the sick to the hospital!" The Municipality received the advice with its usual indifference.

But the Speech from the Throne on January 19, though it said little in respect of the plague, said just what was needful: "Take the most stringent measures." It was high time. The plague was now spread over the whole province of Bombay. It was no longer a local matter. To subdue it was an "imperial necessity," to quote Lord Sandhurst's apology for interference.

The Governor now interfered directly in the matter. The very next day he appointed a special Plague Officer to inspect the city and "advise" the Commissioner. Then an Assistant Health Officer, twenty medical officers, and others deemed requisite were appointed. Not content with this, the Governor, early in February, had a special Epidemic Disease Act passed, and published a Notification authorizing, and in fact directing, the Municipal Commissioner to demolish buildings unfit for human habitation, to destroy infected articles, to require abatement of overcrowding, and to do other things necessitated by the exigency of the occasion. The care of the city was now taken by Government officers. Segregation camps were built; and a regular inspection of houses was begun. The Governor's right hand in carrying out these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reforms was Genl. Gatacre. The mortality of the city for the week ending February 9 was 1,911, the plague-mortality, 1,371, which, considering the greatly decreased population (for the natives were still fleeing by the thousands every day) was higher than for the last week of December. There was in fact no indication that the virulence of the plague was abating when the Government took control of the city.

While the Municipality did nothing but protest against the "wanton waste of money" involved in the carrying out of sanitary rules, the Government subdued the plague. On March 5 the Gatacre Committee was appointed: this took the sanitation of the city completely out of the hands of the Municipality. The Committee was expressly stated to be "subordinate only to Government." The Health Officer was not put on the Committee at all. The Municipal Commissioner was put on only to consent to what Government demanded. The Municipal Corporation were curtly directed "to carry into effect without delay any measures which may be ordered by the Committee." In other words the Corporation were reduced to a political cypher.

Under this sting municipal lassitude vanished. The seventy-two members of the Corporation became furious, and declared that they would not be suppressed. After this explosion they sank back into their customary attitude of careless indolence; and, thereafter, as regards the plague, the Municipality drops out of sight.

Times were changed now in Bombay. The natives were told that the sick would be compelled to go to the hospital. Four hospitals were open to plague-patients. Hospital-huts were erected in various quarters. There were soon in the city forty-one hospitals and six hundred segregation huts. The hospital staff was strengthened. Nurses from England were cabled for. Women inspectors and physicians were appointed to examine native women; medical certificates were insisted on; restrictions were put upon returning inhabitants liable to bring the plague back with them; an army of men was sent out to inspect and cleanse the city; an extra staff of nearly a thousand men was created in the Health Department; one of four thousand in the engineering department; the idle military were put to work; concealed cases of plague were artfully detected; the Corporation were told that if they did not at once settle the question of the disposal of refuse (they had been dawdling over the matter for six months) it would be settled for them; the shanties of disease and death were burned down by the hundred; last, the great intramural graveyard of the Mahomedans was closed. This, however, is but a partial list of the many things neglected hith-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erto, and now accomplished only by the intervention of Government. The latter's care extended in all directions. The Municipality gave no compensation to the poor wretch whose infected goods were burned: the Government ordered compensation to be paid. The Municipality did nothing to soften the horror of the "cart of death," as the natives called the hospital-van: the Government not only improved the hospital building, which had been a disgrace to civilization, but even had rubber tires put upon the wheels of the van,—thus again softening the rigor of the law.

The mettle of their new rein-holder was soon tested by the Sunni Mahomedans, the most obstructive among the natives. When segregation was first suggested in October, the Sunni leaders opposed it; and in the Municipality their representatives were insolent enough to say that any such order would be resisted. That order was now given. The Sunnis could not believe it was intended to be taken seriously. They thought that one or two petitions and a threat or two would end the matter now as it had been ended six months before. They sent petition after petition, each more impudent than the last. They threatened resistance. But instead of yielding, the Governor said "*You must obey*"; and they obeyed. For the first time since December the plague mortality now stood in three figures instead of four. In the week ending March 2 the deaths due to plague were 938 (the week before, they had been 1,108); three weeks later they were 600; by April 20 they were 310; by May 15 they were 100 for the week. The stream of outgoing natives had continued almost undiminished till February. Then there was a back-eddy; and soon the tide turned. By the end of March the outgoing and returning inhabitants nearly balanced each other; but thereafter the latter were in excess. By April confidence was restored; and at the end of that month the plague was no longer of epidemic character anywhere in the Presidency. Oddly enough the daily death-rate began to diminish from the very day of the Notification, February 10, which inaugurated the energetic policy of Government. But informally the governmental policy had already been introduced. Whatever credit be given to Dr. Haffkine's services in aiding the Government to suppress the plague, the chief praise must rest with the Government itself. Nor was the weather an important factor. In fact it was warmer in October than in February.

To one well acquainted with Indian affairs the bare record of these events is full of significance; but for those who do not understand the political situation in India a word of explanation may be necessary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Anglo-Indian press is full of complaints against the apathy of the natives, their inability to meet any crisis, their do-nothing policy as contrasted with their loquacity. On the other hand, the native press complains still more bitterly of Anglo-Indian lack of sympathy and of intelligent comprehension of native character. Again, the municipalities are extremely jealous of governmental control. Nothing distressed the Bombayans—even those who were ashamed of their own City Fathers—so much as to see these Fathers put on the shelf by Government. Finally, the Anglo-Indians, especially those who have spent their lives in India, are continually harping on the Mutiny of 1857. Very few of them really understand the political background of the Mutiny. They are prone to believe that the natives are still in a state of sub-sedition and that the slightest disturbance may result in a volcanic eruption of native forces. The history of the plague is an object-lesson in respect of all these points.

As to the apathy of the natives as contrasted with the energy of the Anglo-Indians, every reader must have noticed that the most conspicuous example of personified apathy was the Municipal Commissioner, who is an Englishman. This officer was ably seconded in his do-nothing policy by the chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, by the Police Officer, and by the Engineering Officer, all of whom are English. The English Health Officer, though his labor was ill-directed, cannot be included with these; but from a wider point of view his attitude is also significant. For while the Anglo-Indian press blamed the "native apathy" of the Municipality it appeared to be forgotten that a third of the Municipal Corporation are not native, but English. Now a minority of a third is strong enough to make itself felt in word if not in action. But at no meeting of the Corporation, from September to March, was any stand taken by English energy to oppose native apathy. I am far from denying the existence of this fault among the natives; but to cite it as characteristically national is manifestly unjust. Moreover, it must be remembered that, while English apathy had no excuse save fear, half of the native's objection to doing anything was simply religious feeling and sympathy for his fellow-countrymen, who shared that feeling in respect of segregation.

Not less exaggerated, however, is the native complaint in regard to Anglo-Indian "lack of sympathy." So far as sentiment is concerned, the plaint is justified, though to make it so often betrays a lack of manliness which may explain the other lack. The Englishman is not in sympathy with the Indian; but, so far as kind acts go, there was never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a conquering race in the world which treated its conquered subjects so generously and so thoughtfully. It was the Municipality's own officers that offended most against the delicacy of the Hindus and Mahomedans in the matter of personal inspection. The Municipality as a body did not even suggest those alleviations of distress which, on taking control of the city, Lord Sandhurst immediately introduced. Not to the Corporation, with its two-thirds majority of natives, but to the "unsympathetic" Englishman were due the women inspectors, physicians, and nurses, so requisite to allay the discomposure of those native women who by the laws of their society and religion are not permitted to be seen by other men than their husbands.

The relation of town and presidency in India can hardly be a matter of much interest to the general reader; and this point may be dismissed with the remark, that what is needed there, as is shown by the action of the municipalities, is more centralization of power, and more control as well as more interest in municipal affairs on the part of the general Government. As the Governor ousted the local authorities, the same scenes took place in other towns besides Bombay. At Karachi, a terrible sub-centre of plague, the municipal officers felt so outraged at the Government's interference that they all resigned. With so small a proportion of the population instructed in Western thought it is obviously necessary that Government should not only have control of the local centres, but should exercise it frequently enough to get the natives accustomed to it. This is particularly true in regard to such matters as sanitation. Filthy as was Bombay when the plague broke out, the condition of Calcutta, at the present moment, from a sanitary point of view, is much worse. The Lieutenant-Governor took the liberty of saying so last winter. The Municipality answered him with a storm of abuse. The natives are quite content with insanitation. It is evident that Government should take such matters out of native control till the Indians are educated up to the point where they can take care of themselves.

But these are minor points. The great political lesson of the plague is taught by the result of Government's unbending attitude toward the prejudices of the Sunni Mahomedans. There can be no doubt but that the plague would have been suppressed in October had the same attitude been adopted by the Municipal Commissioner. But the real reason why the Commissioner did not carry out the plan of segregation was that he was alarmed at the determined opposition of the natives. When their representatives, especially those of the Mahomedans, in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sisted that the populace would resist segregation *vi et armis* the Commissioner yielded the point; and the whole wretched business of the winter followed. But, in speaking to the same natives on the same subject, Lord Sandhurst said: "Let there be no talk of resistance; for, as a great steamer cuts through the water, so surely will Government cut through every obstacle." And what happened? A few riots took place in the city and suburbs (on March 8 and 21, April 6 and 7), but there was no real resistance. A show of force dissipated the malcontents. In all that effervescence of seditious talk there was not one solid particle of danger. The supposed volcano turned out to be a harmless geyser. But the metaphor is too strong. Let me say rather that the fanatical violence of which the Municipality had dared to boast proved to be but a nettle in a strong hand.

In point of fact the India of '97 is not the India of '57. Then there was silence and murder: now there is bluster and obedience. The chief seditious talk is uttered by that most harmless of natives, the Bengali Babu. In the last forty years a new generation of Mahomedans has come upon the stage. In 1857 the Mussulman still felt himself superior to the Hindu, and able to attempt a *coup d' état*. He has now no political influence: the intelligent Hindu has outstripped the Mussulman. The former is rich and holds office: the latter is poor and has no political standing. But the Hindu will never revolt: he is too much afraid of his own countrymen, and is very glad to stand under the Sirkar's umbrella.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FARM COLONIES OF THE SALVATION ARMY.

THE Salvation-Army method of dealing with the question of the Unemployed is, in brief, to place Waste Labor on Waste Land by means of Waste Capital; thus combining this Trinity of Waste, the separation of which means the destruction of each, the coöperation of which means the prosperity of all.

In every nation in which our world-wide work has been carried on we have found ourselves confronted with the sombre phantom of direst poverty. Its proportions have varied; but its ghastly characteristics have been everywhere much the same.

Our business has carried us directly to this veritable "Hell Gate" of society. How to perforate the rock and honeycomb its mass with such moral dynamite as shall enable us some day, at the touch of a button, to shatter the vast obstruction to the harbor of peace and prosperity, has been our daily study and our nightly dream. However visionary the prospect may appear to others, to us it is a very tangible reality. There is but a step from the experimental accomplishments of the past to the unlimited possibilities of the future,—from the acorn to the oak, from the seedling to the tree, from the tiny rivulet to the boundless ocean.

Are we too optimistic? Have we not a right to be so? Would not the very stones cry out against us if we were anything else? Stretching before us lies the vast panorama of six brief years' accomplishment. Wealth, learning, influence,—those great factors in modern achievement,—are conspicuous by their absence from our ranks. The magic wand of the millionaire has conjured for us no showers of gold. No halls of science have adorned our horizon; no political stars have illumined our firmament; and yet, springing "of the people," existing "for the people," and, therefore, supported "by the people," there has flashed forth from the apparent nothingness of a creative Providence, a meteor which has lightened the intense darkness of modern poverty by the benign rays of nascent hope, love, peace, and prosperity.

Within the brief space of six years there have sprung into existence, mushroomlike, some four hundred institutions, dotted like light-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

houses along the dreary wreck-bestrewn shores of pauperdom, each supplied with such life-saving apparatus as enables them collectively to drag *daily* from the, alas! myriads of sinking souls, no fewer than ten thousand at a time. Think of it, oh ye who are tempted to gaze with hopelessness into those seething, storm-tossed waters, or to fold your hands in the helplessness of despair, or even to view with a measure of self-complacency the often self-inflicted woes of miserable humanity!

The financial outlay for the maintenance of this "Bridge of Sighs," —may we not rather call it a Bridge of Hope?—over which there pass daily twice ten thousand weary feet and weeping eyes, ten thousand aching hearts and storm-wrecked lives—is close upon one million dollars a year. For, though the cost of agency is practically eliminated, owing to the fact that rescuers and rescued share the same fare and shelter, nevertheless, heavy rents, and often taxes, have to be paid, and large sums laid out for equipment and food, in addition to the outlay sometimes required for improved sanitation.

How then are we able to raise so large a sum? Here comes in one of the most important features of our work; namely, its self-supporting character. The bulk of the money, and this in ever-increasing ratio, *is contributed by the Submerged themselves.* This is surely one of the most hopeful features of the situation. To those who disbelieve in the salvability of the masses of our poor,—*their willingness to work out their own regeneration*,—it may be a surprise to learn that at least three-fourths of this large sum is contributed by the Submerged.

In places where the work has been longest established, the proportion is still greater. In the city of London, for instance, we sheltered last year a daily average of more than five thousand people at a cost of $493,000. Of this amount, those whom we helped contributed no less than $470,000, leaving only the small margin of $23,000 for the charitable public to find. The entire cost of supervision was less than 5 per cent; while the above expenses included rents, rates, taxes, furniture, fittings, material, food, and all other outlays.

Our social operations in the United States have made remarkable progress during the past twelve months; our institutions having increased from about fifteen to over seventy, and their accommodations from five hundred to more than two thousand. The minimum cost of supporting criminals and paupers in public institutions is about $2.00 a week for food alone, besides all the expenses of buildings and supervision. In some jails the contract rate for feeding prisoners is 35 cents a day, exclusive of all other expenses. Now, in the Salvation Army

LIBRARY OF
MAINE WESLEYAN SEMINARY

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we are able to reduce the entire expenses to an average of about 25 cents a day for food, clothing, rental, and supervision, including the least self-supporting of our institutions—such as Children's Homes, and Homes for Fallen Women and Ex-criminals.

To those who are interested in philanthropic enterprises, these facts will have special value and significance. As a rule, to get a quarter down a poor man's throat usually requires an outlay of at least 75 cents in expenses of organization, inquiry, and supervision. For ourselves, estimating the actual cash outlay in assisting 2,000 people throughout the year, at an average of from 20 to 25 cents each per day, the total for the year will be from $150,000 to say $180,000. But even at this low estimate of expenditure, I calculate that the maximum outlay from our charitable funds has been only about one-fourth of the above amount; the balance being contributed in cash or labor by the people whom we have helped.

It will be readily seen, then, that here is an agency and a plan which will make a dollar go to the utmost limit of its purchasing and saving power. Nor is it a mere untried theory, which may be liable to a thousand breakdowns, when put to the test of actual experience. It is indeed a system which has gradually, I might almost say automatically, grown out of practice.

And this leads me to call attention to another singular fact. While the underlying principles involved in our Social Colonies are the very embodiment of simplicity, the machinery itself is of a complex character. It embraces the following main departments:

I. The City Colony.

II. The Farm Colony near the city.

III. The Distant Settlement.

The first of these, the City Colony, includes quite a number of institutions. The different strata of geology find their counterpart among the poor. To the inexperienced eye, the masses of the working-class population of our great cities constitute one vast conglomeration of misery, vice, and crime. On nearer inspection, however, they are found to be classified as distinctly as those who occupy the higher rungs of the social ladder. The honest poor cling tightly to the last remnant of respectability, and will resent any attempt to make them mingle with the vicious and the criminal. Hence, for the latter, separate institutions are an absolute necessity. At the time of writing, our City Colonies in the United States include:

20 Shelters for men, with accommodation for 2,086.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3 Shelters for women, with accommodation for 250.
8 Rescue Homes for Fallen Women, with accommodation for 200.
2 Prison-Gate Homes for Ex-criminals, with accommodation for 30.
1 Farm Colony.
3 Children's Homes for Waifs and Strays, accommodating 90.
15 Slum Posts under the supervision of 45 officers.
2 Hospitals and Clinics.
5 Labor Bureaus.
5 Salvage Brigades for the collection of waste.
8 Wood Yards for temporary employment.
1 Enquiry Bureau for finding lost friends.
2 Poor Man's Lawyers.
3 Miscellaneous.

78 Institutions, accommodating 2,656 persons.

The above departments are under the charge of about 150 of our most devoted and skilful officers. Their average cost to us, including board, lodging, and other personal expenses, does not exceed $5 a week, though in their worldly callings they would, as a rule, be receiving from $10 to $20; and in some cases they have resigned lucrative positions to join us. Generally the Social Officer receives merely a grant of from $1 to $2 a week for clothing and personal expenses; accepting for food and lodging the same simple fare and shelter that are given to the persons helped. Thus, at a stroke, the cost of supervision is reduced to a minimum by the splendid devotion and self-sacrifice of our officers.

Not only is this the case, but in each department there is trained a band of men and women, who become experts in that particular branch of work. Regulations are drawn up for their guidance, which represent the outcome of actual experience, and which prevent the recurrence of mistakes that may have taken place in the earlier and more experimental stages. A careful system of reporting and inter-communication, together with regular visitation by our most able officers, enables each department to keep in touch with the newest developments in this art of sociology.

It is said that a Chinaman's plan for making a cabbage grow is to walk round it six times every day! It has been this personal attention to the minutest detail of our social cabbage which has been perhaps the principal secret of its rapid growth. Each Social Officer walks round his own particular cabbage many times every day, removes the slugs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from each individual leaf, fertilizes and waters the roots with assiduous care, and reckons that he has succeeded only in proportion to the actual results he is able to produce. The devotion, patience, and self-sacrifice of these men and women are equalled only by the daring and the tact with which they handle the masses among whom they labor, and who recognize them as their acknowledged leaders.

Night after night the girl-captain of the slums will gather an audience of two or three hundred toughs, to whom the magnetism of our Army meetings will be an untiring attraction. The greatest punishment is a sentence of exclusion from those meetings for a week in case of serious misbehavior. Numbers of the worst characters are converted, and, in turn, testify to the wonderful change which has taken place in their lives.

Take again the Rescue Homes. Through the eighty such which are scattered throughout the world, there passed last year more than 4,000 fallen women, of whom nearly 80 per cent were restored to lives of virtue.

The uniformity of plan, the universality of application, and the unity of action which characterize all these various Homes, Shelters, and other institutions throughout the world, contribute greatly to their success.

But it is particularly in regard to the Farm Colony and more distant Settlements that I had intended to write on this occasion. While we look upon our City Colony as an essential feature in our scheme of social regeneration, we believe that the ultimate and only rational cure for the congestion of our great cities is to remove the surplus population to the land.

This is our great quarrel with the pauper policy and criminology of most civilized countries at the present day. Instead of the surplus being removed, it is accumulated in reservoirs of ever-increasing magnitude, where, without any natural outlet, the waters stagnate; breeding corruption, disease, and death. Those same waters judiciously distributed over the arid surface of the sparsely populated soil of our vast agricultural areas would produce a rich harvest, not of millionaires, but of thrifty, honest, self-supporting husbandmen,—a yeomanry who would be our nation's pride and strength. The divorce of the small landed proprietor from the soil is the root-cause of the depressed state of agriculture; and, until the balance of population can be restored from the city to the country, permanent prosperity on a national basis seems to me well-nigh an impossibility.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During a recent visit to our Farm near Seattle, I was conversing with a shrewd German farmer who owned a small tract of land near ours. We had just been eating some of his potatoes,—"Beauty of Heaven" was the name that he had given them, and certainly they seemed quite fit for an angelic table,—and I was questioning him as to his farm, his family, and his success. He had been there eight years, he told me,—years of terrible financial depression in the neighboring cities of Seattle and Tacoma. "I see very little money," he remarked. "It does not matter to me whether the Gold or Silver party win the day. All the banks in Seattle may break to-morrow, but it does not affect me. I have abundance of food for myself and family; and there is enough over to pay for clothing and schooling. What more do I require?" He was not depending on the hired labor of others. His "Beauty of Heaven" potatoes tasted all the sweeter for having been planted with his own hands. His children were growing up to manhood around him. Of land there was enough and to spare. His simple wants were all supplied. To adopt his own language, what more did he require?

What that one individual had accomplished for himself by dint of his personal energy and resourcefulness, the Salvation Army is seeking to do for for thousands who have not been gifted by nature with the same opportunities, nor the same skill. The surplus population of our cities neither can nor will conduct their own exodus to the land of peace and plenty, which might and ought to be theirs. But, placed under suitable leadership, that is, with leaders who understand their habits and have no axes of their own to grind, they are capable of supplying the hiatus which separates us from national prosperity,—an ever-broadening hiatus, and one which, alas! I venture to predict, will go on broadening until this particular missing link has been supplied.

I know what is so commonly said in regard to the depressed state of agriculture, and the impossibility of making it pay, even with the help of modern improvements and appliances. But I am not pleading for large farms or fortunes. Frankly speaking, I am glad the time has come when the large ranch has almost ceased to be an attraction to capital, inasmuch as it will afford an opportunity for the working-man to get at the soil, to become his own farmer, his own laborer, his own producer, and his own consumer.

Let it not be supposed, however, that because the large ranch, in which the small farmer has become eliminated from the soil, fails to pay interest on its borrowed capital, or to afford the prospect of quickly making a vast fortune, the yeoman owner of a small block of land can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not gain from it a subsistence. India and France afford a positive contradiction to this supposition, even if we were unable to find others nearer home. By dint of persistent toil, without even the aid of fertilizers, the Indian peasant will extract from one or two acres of impoverished soil a living for his family, albeit at least half the gross produce has to be handed to the proprietor in payment of rent and taxes, or to the money-lender for exorbitant interest. And yet his instruments are the most primitive; while every innovation is eyed with suspicion as a possible breach of caste and time-honored tradition.

It is upon the above facts that we base our Colonial plans. We plead with capital, if only in its own interests, to afford the working-man a fair chance of getting at the land. We do not ask for *charity*, or *alms*. We desire nothing better than that the whole effort should be placed on a purely commercial basis, under the personal superintendence of business men of approved probity, discretion, and energy.

During my recent visit to San Francisco I was invited to address the Chamber of Commerce upon the question; the President himself taking the chair. As a result it was resolved that a committee of fifteen leading citizens be appointed to coöperate with the Salvation Army in our plans. Briefly the scheme was as follows: A sum of not less than $25,000 was to be raised for preliminary expenses, either by donations or as a loan on favorable terms: A tract of two or three thousand acres of land was to be bonded, and divided into small allotments of not more than five to ten acres. Cottages were to be erected, the land fenced and partly prepared, and, according to the discretion of the management, poultry and other stock supplied. Upon these allotments carefully selected Colonists were to be settled, and a weekly rent charged which would be sufficient to pay off capital and interest by easy instalments. For instance, supposing the value of a five-acre lot to be

Land, at $40 per acre	$200
Cottage	150
Improvements and Stock	150
Total	$500

a weekly rental of $1 would amount to 10 per cent on the above. Of this, say 5 per cent would be for interest, and 5 per cent for repayments of capital, with liberty to pay off the balance at any earlier time, or by larger instalments. In this way the $25,000 would enable fifty families to be settled on 250 acres, divided up into five-acre blocks, the value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the land being estimated at $40 an acre. If, however, the land were not paid for in advance, but only on the instalment principle, about eighty families could be settled on four hundred acres. Allowing an average of four persons to each family, more than three hundred souls could thus be provided for. The $25,000 thus invested would be drawing an annual income of $2,500, of which $1,250 would be paid as interest, if the money had been borrowed; while the balance would either pay off the capital or be re-invested. If the entire sum were raised in donations, the 10-per-cent income would serve to settle additional families; while the original sum would be turned over several times.

It may be asked, how should we insure the payment of the weekly rent? The answer is: Partly by the employment of the Colonists on the settlement at a fixed scale of wages, and partly by placing the Colony in such proximity to the large ranches, which abound in California, that the members of the family could be able to earn perhaps more than sufficient for this purpose. In other cases Colonists would be selected who had some temporary employment in the city, possibly of an uncertain character. That large class who, living perpetually on the borders of the maelstrom of destitution, carry on a precarious and painful existence would be encouraged in this way to supplement their scanty income and to prepare for the evil day of commercial panic. The wife and children would live upon the farm, where the husband would spend his week-ends and his holidays, till at last he would be able to snip the last cord that tied him to the town. Large numbers of the semi-destitute artisan classes would be willing thus to try their wings and feel their feet who otherwise would not dare to launch out upon this new mode of existence.

It may be asked why the Salvation Army should particularly interest itself in this kind of work, and whether for the purpose it would not be better to dispense with the element of religion? Doubtless there would be nothing to prevent the above plan from being successfully carried out by other organizations, whether of a secular or religious character. I venture to think however, that the Salvation Army supplies a peculiarly suitable agency of which it would be well for capital to avail itself. To carry out an exodus of an extensive character—there are three million people in our large cities requiring to be handled—will demand an agency which, in my opinion, must combine the following qualifications:—

1. *Cheapness.* Otherwise the scheme will be swamped in the expense of supervision.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. *Honesty.* Otherwise the selfish greed of the agents will appropriate to a handful of individuals the benefits which are intended for the mass.

3. *Skill.* For a good fool is almost as certain, unintentionally, to lead an excellent enterprise into the ditch of failure as a clever rascal will, to suit his own purposes.

4. *Numbers.* Since the successful oversight and manipulation of large masses of men have been always found to depend on organized supervision.

5. *Self-sacrifice.* An agency which is thinking only of its own salaries and emoluments cannot inspire others with the spirit of cheerful unselfishness so essential to the success of such an enterprise.

6. *Ability to inspire confidence in those whom it seeks to lead.* This is perhaps the most important of all. The Salvation Army needs no introduction to the working-man. The uniform of its officer is his or her passport to every heart and home, to the lowest dives and saloons, to the cottage and the attic. To create this confidence has been the work of years. Its value it would be difficult to overestimate. These classes have so often been exploited in the interests of mere speculators that they view with suspicion even the most tempting offers, and prefer the evils which they know to the uncertainties and failures at which they can only guess.

Especially is this the case with the married working-man, who would furnish the most solid and reliable Colonist. Family ties of affection cause the worthiest of these to step warily in the direction of any new paths, of the safety of which he is not absolutely sure.

But where the necessary shepherding is supplied, and the pledges of good faith exist, it will be found comparatively easy to supply in large numbers selected and suitable Colonists—those who are most likely to insure the success of the scheme. We have at the time of writing 730 posts, under the charge of 2,300 of our American officers. These would form suitable centres or agencies for the careful selection of large bodies of recruits, who could be trained, equipped, and sent to the Settlements in larger or smaller numbers as required.

The selection and training of the Colonists, I regard as one of the most essential features of our scheme. For this purpose, in addition to the sifting process to which the individuals are or can be subjected in our City Colonies, we are organizing :

a. Working-men's lectures on agricultural subjects, whereby simple instruction can be given ;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

b. Vacant lot farms, for the utilization of vacant lots in large cities, on the plan so successfully inaugurated by Governor Pingree, of Detroit;

c. Small farms in the neighborhood of cities, where a further system of rough-and-ready preparation can be gone through.

No Colonist whose character had not been thoroughly tested would be sent to any distant Settlement; thus breakdowns would be reduced to a minimum.

It may be asked, how far is land available for the purpose of these settlements? My reply is, that on this score there is absolutely no difficulty. Vast tracts of fertile soil have been already placed at our disposal, on the most liberal terms. In addition, some influential gentlemen interested in irrigation projects for arid America are pressing upon our attention the grand possibilities that exist in those vast regions. The success which has attended similar efforts under my own observation in India compels me to regard with great hopefulness these proposals; and I trust that in the not distant future, with the coöperation of these gentlemen, some successful colonies may be established by us in these districts.

At least I may promise that, so far as land, climate, water, and Colonists are concerned, no difficulty whatever need be anticipated. The one essential that is at present lacking, owing to the existing distrust in all forms of agricultural enterprise, is *capital.* That this will ultimately flow in sufficient quantities in the required direction, I think there can be no reasonable doubt; especially if a network of village banks, based on the Raiffeisen system be introduced, thus affording both the credit and the security which in the case of small agricultural holdings would be absent in the ordinary city bank.

What I would suggest is: First—that a central national council of influential gentlemen, similar to the one recently constituted in San Francisco, but with a national scope, be appointed, to coöperate with the Salvation Army in its schemes. Second—that in communication with this council there be sub-committees formed in each State, county, or city, where suitable openings may exist. Third—that leading philanthropists, capitalists, and landowners should be invited to coöperate with these central or branch councils. Further, I would propose that a definite plan of campaign be inaugurated, secretaries and treasurers appointed, funds raised, and a systematic effort made to grapple with our great pauper problem upon the principles above laid down, and on a scale worthy of the vast needs of the suffering poor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I venture to say that if this be done, a colossal work can be quickly inaugurated, and placed on a self-sustaining and self-propagating basis. Nay, I would affirm that to do it on a large scale,—a scale worthy of the emergency and of our national honor,—will be found easier than to conduct here and there mere hole-and-corner experiments, which by their very timidity invite failure. The momentum of numbers would help to carry the enterprise over the bar of its initial difficulties. The social regeneration of the masses by the wholesale process will be found, I believe, to be easier than by the usual retail methods. It will also be more economical, and will furnish to the world an imposing object-lesson in "pauperology," if I may be permitted to coin the expression. It will thus be possible, if I mistake not, to prove to the most Malthusian mind that, after all, God is not mistaken in allowing the existence of so many human beings, that Mother Earth is still big enough and fertile enough to provide food and work for many times over her existing family, and that the worst form of folly and extravagance is that which treats as waste and superfluous matter the glorious crowning-piece of creation which bears the impress and the image of its Master Mind.

Time was when a man was thought to be worth more than a sheep: now he is valued at less than a Californian ground-squirrel; inasmuch as we can neither poison him, eat him, nor sell his skin! This cannot be good economy, philosophy, statesmanship, or Christianity. Something must be wrong somewhere. I trust I have been able to make it sufficiently plain what that something is and wherein consists the remedy.

The statesman or philanthropist who will write his name on the grateful memories of posterity will be the one who proves, that even for this world,—to say nothing of the next,—it is more profitable to plant a human being in the soil than to grow a potato or a beet; that a flesh-and-blood dollar is worth more than either a gold or silver one; that the machinery of willing hands and thinking brains and tender hearts is worth more than the most wonderful discoveries of science; that the measure of a nation's prosperity is the happiness of its poor; and that the removal of pauperism is the true measure of the success of its Christian statesmanship.

FREDERICK DE L. BOOTH TUCKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED